THE MUSLIM WORLD

VOL. XXXVIII JULY, 1948 No. 3

VICARIOUS SACRIFICE: THE CHRISTIAN VIEW

I. *The human situation.* Rightminded people admit that they have sinned and deserve God's condemnation, so they are faced with a serious situation. Some deal with it by saying that they must confess their sins and try to do better; but is this satisfactory? Does it not suggest that those who are in the wrong can by their own efforts set things right? To think in this way is to look on God as one who can be put under the obligation of recognizing the righteousness of His creatures and admitting them to His favour, and so to be guilty of the sin of pride which is possibly the greatest sin of all. An erring creature cannot thus approach his Creator.

Others express a similar view in better terms. They say God will forgive those who truly repent and ask forgiveness, and that nothing more is necessary. It is important to understand what this really means. When they ask forgiveness, is it because they hate their sin or because they fear its consequences? No doubt some pray with a sincere desire not only for forgiveness of what is past, but also for God's grace to enable them to do better in future. Yet possibly the majority may be interested more in forgiveness than in delivery from the power of sin within them. If so, they are thinking primarily of themselves and of how they can be delivered from sin's punishment. They are not looking at sin in a sufficiently serious manner.

The Christian view of man's sin is very different. Sin is a wrong we have done which needs forgiveness, but it is more than that. It is something in our very nature which separates us from God. Whether or not one speaks of original sin, the fact stands that all men are sinners. Human na-

ture is corrupted, so that some lose all desire for amendment, and others imagine that they have no need of any. The problem is therefore not merely one of how our past wrongdoing is to be forgiven, but also of how our evil nature is to be changed. Since this is the situation, man cannot put himself right with God, or produce the conditions which will remove the separation caused by sin.

II. *The attitude of God.* God's relation to man is often unsatisfactorily conceived. It may be expressed in terms of the relationship between a great king and an obscure subject. The subject may do wrong, but cannot by his wrongdoing cause any real harm to his king, who may decide to say nothing about the matter. Those who think in such terms take a low view of God's relation to man and show a complete lack of appreciation of the enormity of sin.

Curiously enough, it is possible to think of God as a great King unaffected by what His creatures do, and at the same time think of Him as loving (cf. *Qur'ān,* xi, 90). But surely to be loving connotes something very different from the attitude of a great king to a humble subject. A king may show condescension, but condescension is not love. If God is loving, or if, as the New Testament says, God is love, His relation to man is very different, and accordingly sin is very serious. It is not merely an offense against a great king who cannot really be harmed by what we do; it is an offense against love.

Where there is love there is a longing for association, and therefore when we say that God loves, we mean not simply that He condescends, but that He desires to have the friendship of the objects of His love. God who has created all things made man different from the rest of creation, for man is a reasoning being who can know God. In making man in this way God must have had a purpose; and if we hold that God loves, we must believe that God had the purpose of admitting man to His love so that He and man might live together in the unity of love. The relation between God and man is a relationship of persons, but unfortunately this relationship has been broken by man's sin

and must somehow be put right. Something must be done to change man's nature, and clearly man cannot do this himself; so God must take the initiative. And since God is love He naturally does so, for it is the nature of love to seek to remove every cause of separation, but to do it in a manner which appeals, not in one which compels.

III. *God's initiative.* How can God take the initiative? He can send a message through a prophet to tell men that He loves them and that He is ready to forgive and reinstate them. Indeed, He has done so. But is this enough? Can such a message produce the conditions which make men realize the heinousness of sin, desire deliverance from its power, and seek communion with God? With some it may, but such a message in itself cannot bring convincing realization to many. And those who do believe such a message may simply look on its promise of forgiveness as an easy way out of a difficulty, forgetting that God knows the intents of the heart as well as the words the mouth utters.

If God is to deal with sin in a manner which will save men from both its guilt and its power, He can do so in no better way than by meeting it and vanquishing it within the sphere of humanity. This is where we are brought face to face with the Gospel which declares that the Eternal Word took flesh and lived a human life. Paul says, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself" (2 Cor. v, 19). "In Him (i.e. Christ) dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii, 9). In Jesus we see the love of God making an approach to man to redeem him from sin and bring him to God. In the work of Jesus we see the work of God.

Jesus, in His earthly life, displays such purity, goodness and love as we see in no other, and we know that this shows what God is like, for the best that we can see or know must be true of God. In Palestine Jesus went about continually doing good, and He was rewarded by the worst that men could do. He was put to death on a cross, dying a death of shame. When He went up to Jerusalem He knew that men were plotting against Him and that they wished to kill Him.

He could therefore have gone elsewhere and hidden Himself; but He chose the Cross, "despising the shame." He gave Himself as a willing sacrifice.

IV. *The Sacrifice, an act of God.* When we speak of sacrifice it should not be imagined that God demands that someone be punished, or that man must provide a sacrifice, before God can pardon and reinstate man. In Jesus, the Eternal Word of God incarnate, we have such a sacrifice as man could never have provided. Here we do not have a sacrifice offered by man to God; we see a work of God within the sphere of humanity. God Himself provides the sacrifice.

In this sacrifice we find both divine condemnation of sin and divine love. He who had done no sin made Himself one with man and felt the burden of man's sin, as man's representative, in a way in which sinful man was incapable of feeling it. In the Cross of Calvary we see sin in all its horror. We see what sin can do, and we see Jesus bearing man's sin. As we look at the Cross we see not simply the death of a martyr; we see the Holy One in the place of sinners, and our hearts are overwhelmed by the enormity of sin. If Jesus, like many another who has suffered unjustly, had called down curses on His persecutors, we could not think of Him as the Saviour of the world, and we could not call His death a vicarious sacrifice. The fact that He identified Himself with man, and felt the burden of man's sin, makes all the difference. He prayed God to forgive His persecutors. He entered into the experience of man's sin to such an extent that it appeared for a little as if He who had done no sin were deserted by God, suffering the separation which sin entails. But He came out of the shadow with the words on His lips, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit."

In no clearer way could God's condemnation of sin be declared than in the death of Jesus. But in the very act of condemnation we see the love of God. As we gaze on that Cross we see God's forgiveness. The sinless Jesus bore the ignominy of the Cross in a spirit of love and tenderness

which displays the love of God for man. So even in the very act which condemns sin we see the love and the forgiveness of God. And what we see here within the sphere of human experience shows us what the sin of man has always cost God. A New Testament writer indicates this when he speaks of Christ as "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii, 8).

In human relationships we sometimes meet instances which may be quoted as a faint parallel to what we see in the Cross. For example, a youth may stray into evil ways and bring disgrace on himself. His father loves him, and because of his love he feels the disgrace as if it were his own. He feels it in a way in which the erring son is incapable of feeling it. He enters into the shame because of his love for his son, and this very self-identification with him may produce penitence and amendment. If a man who is himself a sinner can endure such an experience with redemptive results, do we not see how the vicarious suffering of the sinless Jesus can avail for mankind?

Jesus died in the place of sinners, but that is not the end of the story. On the third day He rose again. He is alive for evermore, and by the working of the Holy Spirit we can be one with Him and enter into new life. His death declares that there is no need for the separation between God and man to continue, and by His triumphant risen life we can have the power to live in communion with God.

V. *The new relationship.* There is an aspect of the sacrifice which has still to be considered. The mere fact that Jesus underwent such an ordeal in such a way on behalf of humanity does not in itself put us right with God. When we ask what constitutes a sacrifice we may learn something from the Old Testament. In Old Testament times animals were sacrificed as a means of removing the separation between God and man caused by sin. These animals had to be unblemished, but the sacrifice did not consist simply in the slaughtering of an unblemished animal. The worshipper had to place his hand on the victim's head as a sign that he identified himself with it. Then the blood was shed and

poured on the altar. The Old Testament asserts that the blood is the life; therefore the shedding of the blood and the pouring of it on the altar spoke of setting free the life of the victim with which the worshipper had identified himself to ascend to God. The worshipper believed that in this way he was brought near to God and the barrier caused by sin was removed.

When we speak of the sacrifice of Jesus we must keep in mind such conceptions, but while we do so, we must remember that in Jesus there is a spiritual reality such as we can never find in the Old Testament sacrificial system. The physically unblemished animal was an involuntary sacrifice; Jesus "through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God" (Heb. ix, 14). He accepted the Cross and laid down His life for us all. And that life which was laid down for us has entered into the holiest place.

Jesus has done all that is necessary to reconcile us to God, but His sacrifice, like every other sacrifice, is not complete without the worshipper identifying himself with it. When we see what He endured, we cannot be satisfied with deploring the wickedness of men which brought about His death. We must enter into the power of His risen life. We must make ourselves one with Him by faith. When we do that, we receive in Him the forgiveness of our sins, and, in so far as we live in communion with Him, the power of sin is broken in us, and we have fellowship with God through Him.

JAMES ROBSON

Glasgow

THE "NEW WOMAN" IN MODERN EGYPT OBSERVATIONS AND IMPRESSIONS*

Not quite fifty years ago, there appeared, in Cairo, a book with the title *Taḥrîr al-Mar'a* which was destined to have far-reaching consequences. Its author, Qāsim Emīn, dealt with a question of the greatest importance for the Muslim community, for he advocated the emancipation of Muslim women. For the Muslim this term meant, first and foremost, their release from the restrictions imposed on them by the wearing of the veil and their customary separation from the world in which the Muslim man moved.

The author, interestingly enough, began his discussion with a demand for better education of the Muhammadan woman. He indicated, by doing so, the paramount importance of education for the improvement of the social status of women and the intimate connection between her intellectual development and her position in and influence on the life of the community. He argued that better education would result in an improvement in the relationship between men and women; the educated woman would be a better mother to her sons, for she would be equipped to supervise their intellectual upbringing and share in her husband's and sons' interests. Last but not least, she would be in a better position to support herself if necessity forced her to do so. Such an emergency might easily arise should her husband die and she be left a widow; moreover, since marriage in Islam could easily be dissolved, a divorced woman might find herself obliged to earn her own livelihood. Even in this early book dealing with the controversial issue of women's emancipation, the author pointed to the importance of women for the life of the nation.

In a second book, called *al-Mar'a al-Jadîda,* "the New Woman," Qāsim Emīn again took up the case for the Muslim woman (1901). With his two books the discussion of these important problems was opened. Amongst the first

* The gist of this paper was presented to the American Oriental Society at their Annual Meeting in New York, March 29-30, 1948.

women to take part in it was Malak Ḥifnī Nāṣif *(Bâḥithat al-Bâdiya).* Her articles appeared first in newspapers and were collected and published later (1910). Deeply interested in the improvement of the relationship between husband and wife, she agreed with Qāsim Emīn that better education was the basis for a better position of women; she pointed to polygamy and the veil as the main roots of the unhappiness of the Muslim woman.

Thus from the very beginning, the problem was defined and focussed on separation and the veil which remained at the center of the arguments in the discussions between the advocates and the adversaries of emancipation. It is significant that Naẓīra Zain ad-Dīn called her first contribution to the controversy "Unveiling and Veil" (1928) *(al-Sufūr wal-Ḥijāb).* In addition, the custom of polygamous marriage and the facility of divorce were condemned by the advocates of women's rights, whereas the conservative school pointed out the advantages of polygamy, such as providing an opportunity for marriage for practically all Muslim women.[1]

The reformers claimed that neither the veil nor the seclusion of women was based on the Qur'ān. This claim is true: the Quranic passages on which later Islam based its treatment of women are in themselves open to diverse interpretation. The veil and the custom of seclusion as practiced in later Islam are not ordained in the Qur'ān; its ordinances are prescriptions given by Muḥammad to his own wives only. It was his intention to raise their social status above that of the ordinary women; as "Mothers of the Believers" he wanted them to be treated with deference and to be easily recognized by their deportment and mode of dress.[2] The strict observances of the veiling of Muslim women and their seclusion, resulting in their inability to participate in the life of the community and restricting their sphere of ac-

[1] See Gertrude H. Stern, *Marriage in Early Islam,* London, 1939, (The Royal Asiatic Society, James G. Furlong Fund, vol. xviii), pp. 78ff. on the institution of polygamy in Muḥammad's time, and my remarks in my review of this book in JAOS, vol. 62, p. 82f.

[2] See the interesting discussion of the veil in G. H. Stern, op. cit., pp. 108-126; for the veil in pre-Islamic Arabic poetry see Ilse Lichtenstadter, "Das Nasîb der altarabischen Qaṣîde" in *Islamica* V (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 43, 47ff.

tivity to their immediate family, came only later. However, through custom and tradition, *sunnah* and *ḥadīth,* which from an early time interpreted the Quranic passages as applying to all Muslimât,[3] veil and seclusion became an integral part of Muslim life, even of Muslim doctrine, so that an attack on them was interpreted as identical with an attack on the fundamentals of Islam. That is why the conservative theologians immediately rose to their defense maintaining that the abolition of these time-honoured customs would uproot age-old institutions and violate sacred law and tradition.[4]

But even while trying to refute the arguments of the advocates of emancipation, its adversaries had to admit the weightiness of the problem. Though with the exception of Turkey and the abortive attempt made in Afghanistan, no Muslim country formally changed its laws and legally abolished the veiling of women and polygamy, a slow evolutionary process is at work which undoubtedly will lead eventually to the actual abandonment of these practices if not to their legal abrogation. It seems that life itself is taking a hand in producing this gradual change in defiance of the objections of the *'ulamâ'*.

After having studied Muslim thought and custom from the traditional literature, I visited last year, for the first time, a Muslim country. Quite naturally, one of the many things that interested me during my three months' stay in Cairo was the question how much the theoretical discussion of the woman's problem had influenced actual life, to what degree the life of a Muslimah had changed in the fifty years which have passed since the appearance of Qāsim Emīn's book.

One fact stands out even at the most casual observation. There are two distinct groups of women, the modern, and, let me call her by way of contrast, the old-fashioned woman.

---

[3] See G. H. Stern, op. cit., pp. 111ff.

[4] The various books and pamphlets written by either faction on this problem have been discussed in detail by Rudi Paret, *Zur Frauenfrage in der arabisch-Islamischen Welt,* Stuttgart-Berlin, 1934, (Veröffentlichungen des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität Tübingen, Heft 8), and by H. A. R. Gibb, *Modern Trends in Islam,* Chicago, 1947 (The Haskell Lectures in Comparative Religion. . . . Chicago 1945), pp. 89-105. See also Louise Fuleihan, "The Arab Women's Congress in Cairo" in THE MOSLEM WORLD, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 316ff. Oct. 1945.

The former is well educated after the western pattern which is very largely French, but also English and, to a lesser degree, German, and resembles her occidental sisters in almost every way. She is greatly interested in all the various aspects of modern life; she is an artist, a writer, physican, educator, even a lawyer, just as is her western counterpart. It is she who has created and is supporting many of the social services in the country: educational and welfare agencies are founded and run by outstanding Egyptian women. While she herself was frequently educated abroad, her daughter attends one of the excellent private schools in Egypt and then finishes her studies at the Fu'ād I University. One of the finest amongst the journals written for this group is "La Femme Nouvelle" *(al-Mar'a al-Jadīda)* in which articles on scholarly and literary subjects, written by men or women, are published, frequently accompanied by beautiful illustrations. The journal appears both in Arabic and in French.

This group of women has formed the Egyptian Union of Women *(Jāmi'at al-Ittiḥād al-Nisā'ī al-Miṣrīya)* founded and headed by Mme Hudā Hānum Sha'rāwī. This Union is participating in the international women's movement by sending delegates to international congresses. Another outstanding representative of the modern, politically-minded Egyptian women is Mme Munīra Thābit who in many newspaper articles, in petitions to the Egyptian Senate, and in lectures and speeches throughout the country is fighting for women's rights. In a book called "Revolution in . . . the Ivory Tower" *Thaura fī . . . l-Burj al-'Aji* (Cairo, 1946), she gives an account of her struggle for the recognition of women as citizens and of her efforts to secure for them the right to vote and to be elected to political office. In many letters and addresses to the Senate and leading personalities, she has for more than twenty years, pleaded this cause and advocated the admittance of women as full-fledged members of the body-politic of her country. While most of the activities of the Egyptian women are directed towards the social improvement of their position and most of their work dedicated to social welfare, Munīra Thābit concentrates all

her energy on the fight for their political status.[5] Her book is an interesting document of this period of ferment and an important source for any account of the women's movement in Egypt. Among her supporters she points to such a high-ranking personality as the late Sa'd Zaghlūl; at present her cause is championed in the pages of *Miṣr al-Fatāt,* the organ of Aḥmad Ḥusain, who is himself the author of a book on *al-Zawâj wa-l-Mar'a,* "Marriage and Woman," with emancipatory tendencies (Cairo, 1946).

Though the westernized woman is undoubtedly of great sociological and psychological interest, exerting a deep influence on the development of women in the Muslim community of her own country and beyond, one cannot help feeling that she forms only a small upper crust. The majority of Egyptian women are represented by what I called the old-fashioned woman of the middle and lower classes of the city and the *fellāḥa.*

It is by watching them that one is able to appraise how little or how much life has changed for the Muslimah. I was amazed at the ease with which these women were moving through the populated streets, both of the "native" and the modern quarters. They crowd, with their babies and their bundles, into the street cars and, though there are compartments reserved for women, it seemed that only few deliberately were looking for them. They were just trying to get on the trams anywhere, apparently not minding to sit in the same compartment with strange men. Though most of them still wear their traditional garments, the veil seems no longer to be enforced throughout. It is comparatively rarely that one sees a deeply veiled woman, wearing a dark shawl wrapped round her head; sometimes I have seen this combined with a western-style print dress,—a most unbecoming outfit. Most of the women who still dress in their ancient

[5] It is interesting to note that amongst the comparatively few women holding responsible office in the United Nations, there are several from Muslim countries: Mme S. T. Hussain as representative from Pakistan, Mmes F. Jamali, B. Afnan, S. Alkhoja, as alternate representatives from Iraq; Mme A. K. Cosma from Syria as advisor (though I do not know whether the latter is a Muslimah or a Christian). This information was taken from Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, LOWUN International News, No. 6/1948, prepared by Gertrude Baer, New York, February 1948.

costume are either unveiled or cover the lower part of their face with a crocheted rhomboid-shaped shawl, a modification of their ancient *burqu'*; however, I have frequently observed a woman removing her face-veil in the presence of men, e.g., in the street car, obviously in order to be more comfortable.

It seems to me that the trend towards discarding the traditional attire is somewhat regrettable. The fact whether or not a woman wears European dress appears to become more and more the criterion for her intellectual progress and social standing.[6] The middle and lower class Egyptian woman should be taught hygiene and cleanliness, both for herself and for her children; then it would matter very little whether she would be wearing an unbecoming western-style dress or a graceful congenial native gown.

The impression one gets watching these women is, on the whole, favourable, if one is unbiased and does not judge them by the unfortunately great number of poor, ragged and dirty ones. They are graceful and charming, especially while they are still young; they are eager to smile, fond of their children, and appear to have a natural intelligence and alertness. They were always pleasant and friendly to me wherever I got in contact with them, either singly or in groups. The fact that I was obviously a stranger and a non-Muslimah did not seem to matter. Whenever I joined them, I was always received with a friendly gesture and without surprise or commotion, whether it happened to be women praying at the shrine of Saiyida Zainab or a group sitting at the feet of a shaikh in the mosque of Ibn Ṭulūn and listening to his religious instruction.

As we have seen, Qāsim Emīn emphasized in his first book the need for women's education. To report adequately on the progress made in this field would, of course, require a detailed study. As an example of what is being done, I may again mention one of my personal experiences. One day, I visited an elementary school in the Ghurīya quarter. I met

[6] H. A. R. Gibb, in "Social Changes in the Near East", in *The Near East, Problems and Prospects* (Chicago, 1945) (Lectures on the Harris Foundation 1942), p. 40, calls this "simply silly."

three young women teachers who were in charge of some sixty girls of approximately six to twelve years. The girls were taught the three "R's" and other elementary subjects; they showed me their books and copybooks, recited Qur'ān and sang some songs for me. All instruction was, of course, in Arabic, and the teachers themselves could speak only Arabic. The children were dressed uniformly in neat white dresses and the teachers themselves wore western dress. It was nearly lunch time for the children and they were given clean wholesome food, evidently chosen with a view to providing for them a well-balanced meal. Altogether, I was greatly impressed by the pleasantness, cheerful quiet, cleanliness, and disciplined smoothness of this school. Though housed in an old-fashioned building in a corner of this "native" quarter, it had a more pleasant atmosphere than many a modern school building.

Such schools are performing an extremely important service. More than anything else, Eastern women, especially those of the lower classes, need education in the most elementary rules of hygiene, cleanliness, the cause and prevention of illness, the treatment of their babies, and other similar knowledge fundamental to the prevention of disease so prevalent in the East. It is in this field that the schools can help very efficiently. This is also a task in which radio could be used to great advantage. It should give health instruction in simple language and in a manner intelligible to all, talk of the importance of cleanliness, point out the dangers inherent in drinking the water from the canals, or right from the Nile (as I have seen it done); it should teach people, and especially the women in their dark garments, not to sit down just anywhere in the streets, regardless of the dirt.[7] Of the three enemies of the Egyptian people, *al-faqr, al-maraḍ wa-l-jahl,* "poverty, illness and ignorance," at least the last could be combated by making full use of the possibilities radio affords. As it is, it seems to be catering largely to the tastes and interests of the higher classes. For example, one

[7] There are no benches in the public parks in the native quarters and the lawns are very badly kept. What could be done is shown by the beautifully landscaped and kept parks at the Barrage which provide a place for picnics for those who can afford to go there.

afternoon I tuned in on a program on educational problems which, in beautiful Arabic, dealt with the treatment of problem children who, amongst other things, would refuse to eat properly. I am sure that that is not the most important problem facing the average Egyptian mother.

It is impossible for me to report, from my own observation, on the question of polygamy. Once, one of the "high-school boys" who constantly attach themselves to the visitor to Cairo to act as guides, talked about the wives of his brother and told me of his troubles with them. However, I doubt whether he was trustworthy; he seemed to tell me what he believed I might like to hear. One of my friends told me that polygamous marriage has become almost negligible; he quoted the figure as 1 in 100,000; another one said that it was still largely practiced among the *fellāḥīn* who in this way would increase the number of members of their family available for work on the soil. The real danger, however, seems to lie not so much in polygamy as in divorce, which, according to one of my most reliable and unbiased informers, a European, is prevalent far more among the poor than among the rich. In divorcing his wife, the husband, according to Muslim law, has to pay the *mahr* (dowry) in full; for the well-to-do this means a financial burden whereas in the poorer classes the *mahr* is rarely paid at all. The poor therefore marry and divorce frequently, substituting a younger woman for one who has grown old. The number of divorced women in the poorer classes therefore poses a real problem. Many of them try to provide for themselves by working as laundresses or in other domestic service; many others are undoubtedly to be found among the innumerable beggar women. Divorce is therefore one of the most important fields where both religious and civil authorities should collaborate in providing a real solution.

The social life of the middle class does not yet seem to have changed decisively. Women still are generally excluded from the company of men. When friends visit his home, the husband receives them without his wife. Though men seem to spend endless hours sitting in the cafés, apparently doing nothing, one never sees a woman with them. Even in religi-

ous ceremonies connected with events in family life, they do not participate together with men. For instance, I once watched, in the Saiyida Zainab quarter, a procession in honour of a circumcision, with all the traditional features: music, dancers, torches, banners; the father and his approximately three year-old son riding on a white horse bedecked with carpets and red ribbons—but no woman participated. I did, however, see them walking in funeral processions, as a group behind the men. With the increasing number of well-educated girls, however, one of the reasons always given for the continued exclusion of women from male society should soon become invalid, namely, that they do not share the intellectual interests of men. This should also contribute to reducing the number of men who marry foreign girls because they are more attractive to them intellectually.

What is the comprehensive picture that the western observer gains from these impressionistic and mosaic-like observations? There is no denying the fact that the East is changing fast; there is a great deal of honest endeavour to adapt Muslim life to the new conditions without giving up the intrinsic values of the old customs. With the increasing westernization, partly in consequence of the requirements of economic conditions and the adjustments necessitated by them, it is unavoidable that women's life, too, will be affected. While this change so far has only reached the higher classes, it will inevitably sooner or later engulf the whole population. It would be desirable that it should come gradually, by education and intelligent guidance rather than by revolutionary decree. What the average middle and lower class Muslim woman badly needs at present is instruction in the fundamentals of personal and family hygiene, in the prevention and treatment of disease, birth control, child care, and nutrition. Equally important is the fight against illiteracy. These are the tremendous tasks laid upon the shoulders of the well-educated modern "New Woman," and in working unselfishly in this field, she would bring the greatest benefit both to her nation and to her religion.

ILSE LICHTENSTADTER

The Asia Institute, New York, N. Y.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE ARABS TO ISLAMIC CIVILIZATION

For many centuries, in fact from the time Europeans first came in contact with the Islamic civilization in Spain and Sicily, they have been accustomed to designate the products of that civilization as "Arab" or "Arabian." Thus many historians refer to "Arabian medicine," "Arab science," "Arab philosophy," "Arab architecture," and so on.

In recent years a powerful reaction has set in against this view. Critics have pointed out that many, perhaps most, of the great figures in the realm of science and philosophy were not Arab by descent, but Syrians, Turks or, more frequently, Persians. Many of these critics have, consequently, been inclined to underestimate the role played by the Arabs in the creation and development of the Islamic civilization, or even to ignore it altogether. An extreme version of this latter view was put forward, not long ago, by the young Egyptian philosopher Abder Rahman Badawi, an admirer and follower of Spengler and Rosenberg. Talking of Salman the Persian he says, "He was a harbinger of the leading part which his race was to play in the spiritual life of Islam. We said the 'leading' part; it would have been more accurate to say the only part. For the truth is that this spiritual life owes almost everything to that many sided, talented and fertile Aryan race which—alone of all the peoples who embraced Islam—was capable of producing it."[1]

In view of such conflicting opinions, it is worth while to enquire into the exact part played by the Arabs[2] in the creation and development of Islamic civilization.

In this paper an attempt has been made to evaluate the

---

[1] *Shakhsiyyat Qaliqah fi 'l-Islam,* Cairo, 1946.

[2] Throughout this paper the word Arab is used in a very restricted sense, to indicate a racial not a linguistic group. In normal usage "Arab" denotes all those whose mother language is Arabic, i.e., the inhabitants of the "Arab World." Here, however, it denotes only the inhabitants of the Arabian peninsula and their descendants.

It is hardly necessary to add that the classification of persons into "Arabs" and "non-Arabs" can only be highly tentative. For the Arabs were scattered widely, though thinly, over the various parts of their empire and mixed very freely with the other peoples, who in turn intermarried on a large scale.

contribution made by the Arabs to Islamic civilization and to compare it with that made by another imperial people, the Romans, to "Roman" civilization. For this purpose a *list* has been compiled of those non-Arabs who distinguished themselves in the various fields of culture. This is followed by a list of those Arabs who similarly distinguished themselves. After that, the Arabs' contribution to the fundamental *institutions* of the Islamic civilization are enumerated and discussed. An attempt is then made to discover the reasons which determined the *particular nature* of the contribution of the Arabs. Finally an *analogy* is drawn between the part played by the Arabs and that played by the Romans in their respective civilizations.

In this article we shall confine ourselves to the eastern half of the Arab Empire, viz. Egypt, Syria, Iraq, the Arabian peninsula, Persia and Central Asia, for in Spain and North Africa genealogies are even more confused than in the eastern countries, and it is even more difficult to distinguish between Arabs and non-Arabs. We shall also confine ourselves to the first five centuries of the Muslim era, which witnessed practically all the creative achievements of the Islamic civilization.

Within those spatial and temporal limits, there is no doubt that a very impressive list can be made of those *non-Arabs* who distinguish themselves in the various fields of culture.

There are first of all the *translators,* whose work laid the foundations for all future development. Most of those who translated Greek texts into Arabic were Nestorian Christians from Syria or Iraq. Thus Qusta Ibn Luqa was a Damascene, while Hunain bin Ishaq came from Hira. Other translators from the Greek included the Jewish Masawaih family and the pagan Thabit of Harran. Similarly Persian texts were translated by Persians, such as Ibn al-Muqaffa' and the Naubakht family and Sanskrit texts by Indians.

Again, the leading *philosophers* were non-Arabs, notably al-Farabi (died 339 A.H.), Ibn Sina (d. 428), Ibn Miskawaih (d. 421) and al Ghazali (d. 505). The only Arab

philosopher was al-Kindi (3rd century A.H.), who can claim to be the founder of Islamic philosophy but whose stature is not comparable to that of his successors.

Theology too, in its various branches, was worked out largely by non-Arabs, such as al-Bukhari (d. 265), the great compiler of the *Ḥadith* (Sayings of the Prophet), al-Baqillani (d. 403) and many of the Mu'tazilite school. Al-Ghazali, the philosopher, must also be mentioned here, since his *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn* is rightly regarded as the counterpart of Aquinas' *Summa.*

Ghazali's influence was largely responsible for the acceptance by orthodox theology of *mysticism.* Here too the leading figures were non-Arabs, notably Junayd (d. 297), and al-Hallaj (d. 309). In the 7th century A.H., Islamic mysticism produced what was perhaps its greatest figure in Jalal al-Din al-Rumi, a native of Bactria.

In the natural sciences, the predominance of the non-Arabs is marked. Thus in *medicine,* we have such distinguished figures as al-Razi (d. 320), with Ibn Sina the leading physician of the Middle Ages, and Ali ibn Abbas al Majusi (d. 384). In *chemistry* there is the enigmatic Jabir ibn Hayyan (8th century A.D.?) whose philosophical views also display much originality. In *mathematics, physics* and *astronomy* practically all the leading men were non-Arabs, e.g. al-Khwarizmi (d. *circa* 230), Al Farghani (d. *circa* 240), Abder Rahman al-Sufi (d. 376), Abu'l-Wafa (d. *circa* 390) and, although he falls outside our period, Omar al-Khayyam (d. 518), the astronomer poet. Perhaps greater than all these is al-Biruni equally eminent in the fields of philosophy, mathematics, astronomy and geography, a Sanskrit scholar, and the author of what is probably the greatest work on India ever written by a foreigner.[3] Non-Arabs also figured prominently in the fields of *historiography* and *geography.* Thus al-Tabari (d. 310), "the Livy of the Arabs," and the geographers al-Balkhi (d. 322) and al-Istakhri (middle of 4th century) were almost certainly non-Arabs, and other

[3] Ibn al Haytham (d. *circa* 430), the greatest Muslim physicist has not been included in this list. He was born in Basra and worked in Egypt, but it is difficult to ascertain his origin.

names might be added of persons who were probably of non-Arab descent, such as Ibn al-Nadim (d. 385), the author of the *Fihrist,* the first biographical bibliography of the sciences, and Ibn Hauqal, the geographer. In the *Shari'a,* or Canon Law, Abu Hanifa (d. 150), the first and greatest of the Jurists was a non-Arab.

Most of the *grammarians,* too, were recruited from among the non-Arab population, notably Sibawaihi (d. 183) and al-Zajjaj (d. 311).

Even in *literature,* the contribution of the non-Arabs is marked. Some of the greatest of the prose writers, such as Ibn al-Muqaffa, the translator, al-Jahiz (d. 255) and al-Hamadhani (d. 398) were non-Arabs, as were also some of the most distinguished of the poets of the first Abbasid period, notably Bashshar ibn Burd (d. 167), Abu 'l-'Atahiya (d. 211), Ibn al-Rumi (d. 283) and Mihyar al-Daylami (d. 428.

Finally, apart from music,[4] which was intimately connected with poetry and in which the pre-Islamic Arab tradition was further developed by the Arabs after their conquests, the Arab *artistic* contribution was negligible. The conditions of life in the Arabian peninsula, except in Yemen, precluded the development of any architecture, and after the conquest the Arabs relied on the subject populations, especially the Copts, Syrians, Armenians and Persians, in all their buildings. The same was true of the decorative arts where, in the words of one authority, "Arabic script (was) the sole Arab contribution to Islamic art."[5]

No attempt has been made, when compiling the above list, to sort out the non-Arabs into their various ethnic groups. One general warning must however be given, viz., that the part played by the Persians is usually overrated, at the expense of the Turkish and other inhabitants of Central Asia, owing to the fact that the Arabic word for "non-Arabs" (*'ajam*) is often used to designate the Persians. Thus, whereas it is usually admitted that al-Farabi was a

[4] For the part played by the Arabs in the development of music see the article on Music in the "Legacy of Islam," especially page 360.

[5] A. H. Christie in *The Legacy of Islam,* p. 113.

Turk it is held that Ibn Sina was a Persian. This, however, has been strongly disputed.[6] Similarly Abu Hanifa is usually stated to be a Persian but there seems to be good evidence for holding that he was an Afghan.[7] Again Abu Nuwas, the poet, is generally claimed by Persians, but the fact is that while his mother was a Persian his father was a soldier in the Umayyad army, stationed in Damascus and sent to Iraq by the Caliph Marwan—and may therefore have been of any nationality.

Confronted with such a bright galaxy, the student may well be inclined to admit that Islamic civilization was wholly the work of non-Arabs. Such a judgment would, however, be at least as erroneous as the opposite one which equates Islamic with Arab culture, and could be as easily refuted.

One might, for instance, make a list of all the Arabs who made their contribution to Islamic civilization and such a list would include all the greatest *poets;* the theologian al-Ash'ari; all the *jurists* except Abu Hanifa (i.e., Malik, al-Shafi'i and Ibn Hanbal); most of the *philologists*; many *prose writers*; such *grammarians* as Khalil Ibn Ahmad (d. 180), the teacher of Sibawaiyhi, and al-Mubarrad (d. 285); the great historian of literature Abu 'l-Faraj al-Isfahani (d. 356) whose name has usually caused him to be mistaken for a Persian but who was in fact a descendant of the Umayyad caliph Marwan Ibn al-Hakam; finally the geographer al-Maqdisī (d. 375), a native of Jerusalem.

Such a list is the more impressive in view of the very small proportion formed by the Arabs to the total population of the Empire. It is most unlikely that the number of Arabs who came in at the conquest could have exceeded 300,000, and subsequent infiltrations, though continuous, were never on a large scale. As against this must be set the 7,000,000 inhabitants of Egypt, the 4,000,000 of Syria and the large Persian, Turkish and other populations. Propor-

[6] A. M. Sayili "Was Ibn Sina an Iranian or a Turk?" *Isis,* volume XXXI, 1.

[7] Charles C. Adams, "Abu Hanifah, Champion of liberalism," MOSLEM WORLD, July, 1946.

tionately to their numbers, the cultural contribution of the Arabs was very great.

But such an approach does not get to the root of the matter. The real contribution of the Arabs to Islamic civilization lay not so much in the geniuses they produced (though one may fairly claim that in the philosopher-poet al-Ma'arri they produced the most original mind of that civilization) as in the social institutions with which they provided the Islamic world.

There is, first of all, the *political framework.* Arab armies conquered a vast empire with a maximum of speed and a minimum of destruction, and Arab dynasties ruled over this empire. But it was not only the caliphs who were Arab. Until the Abbasids removed the capital to Baghdad and surrounded themselves with Persians, the great bulk of the ruling class was recruited from among Arabs. For at least the first 150 years of its existence, the Muslim empire could claim to be an *Arab* empire. And thanks to the peace prevailing in that Empire for two centuries, many peoples who had not previously had a chance now made their contribution to culture, notably the Persians and the Turks.[8]

Even more important was *religion.* Islam has undoubtedly been developed and enriched by many non-Arab theologians, but its most essential ingredient remains the Qur'an, a purely Arabian product.

And with religion came *language,* since in Islam as in perhaps no other great faith language and religion are inseparably connected. The necessity of reading the Qur'an in the original—since translation was not permitted by some—meant that a very thorough grounding in Arabic had to be acquired. The fact that Arabic was the official language, without which employment in the higher government posts was extremely difficult, also gave it a great stimulus.

Finally the intimate connection between literature, es-

[8] It may be objected that whereas the Turks had not produced anything worthwhile before entering the Islamic civilization, the pre-Islamic Persians had evolved an architecture, literature and art of their own and had produced many noteworthy religious leaders such as Mazdak and Mani. Nevertheless it is a fact that after Islam Persian creativity seems to have been greatly stimulated.

pecially poetry, and the Court, made Arabic, rather than Persian or Syriac or Coptic or Turkish, the literary language. Hence we see the following phenomena:

a. All the greatest poets were Arabs. Thus, under the Umayyads, we have al-Akhtal, the Christian Arab, al-Farazdaq and Jarir. In the so-called first and second Abbasid periods (132-334 A.H.) come Abu Tammam (d. 231) and al-Buhturi (d. 284). Finally in the great flowering of the fourth century we find al-Mutanabbi (d. 354), Abu Firas al-Hamdani (d. 357) and, greatest of all, Abu 'l-Ala al-Ma'arri (d. 449).

b. Most of the men of thought listed above as non-Arabs wrote and spoke Arabic at least as well as—and often considerably better than—their native tongues. It is only rarely that we learn that one of them spoke Arabic imperfectly, as did for instance Ibn Sina.

c. Arabic became not only the language of religion, literature and philosophy, but also that of science. Almost all the great scientific works were written in Arabic (the first scientific work in Persian dating from the second half of the 10th century), and Persian and Turkish still contain a very large number of Arabic words in their scientific vocabularies—in fact one might say that their scientific vocabularies are still predominantly Arabic.

This political, linguistic and religious unity formed the basis of the Islamic civilization. Until about the 14th or 15th centuries, there was no part of the Islamic world where a Muslim did not feel at home. The career of the historian, Ibn Khaldun, offers the best illustration of this, since he occupied leading posts in Spain, Morocco, Algeria, and Egypt and was even offered a post by Timur Lank. Earlier, the historian, al Mas'udi (d. 346), and the geographer Ibn Battuta had travelled freely from the Atlantic Ocean to China.

After about the 15th century the Muslim world began to split into two halves, which A. J. Toynbee[9] has called the "Iranic" and the "Arabic," the former including Turkey,

[9] *A Study of History*, 6 vols., Oxford University Press (1935-9).

Persia, Afghanistan, Central Asia and North India, the second what is known today as "the Arab world," i.e., the area lying between Iraq and Morocco. In the former, Persian was the predominant language; in the latter, Arabic. After the Shi'a revolution of Shah Ismail Safavi, in the 16th century, the cultural unity of the Iranic civilization was broken, but that of the Arabic has remained to this day, a lasting monument to the constructive work of the Arab conquerors of the 7th century.

Still, when all is said, the fact remains that the contribution made by Arabs to Islamic thought, science and art was relatively small. This relative sterility in the field of thought and art has not passed unnoticed, and more than one attempt has been made to explain it.

Thus there is the explanation given by Lassen,[10] which bases itself on the national character of the Arabs. According to him, Arabs are characterized by a marked predominance of the will over the emotions, while the latter are in turn much more developed than the intellect. This means that the Arabs are a courageous, active and practical people who are, however, incapable of long sustained or purposely directed action and who are deficient in the deeper kind of imagination. Hence their incapacity to produce any really great works of the imagination such as epics or tragedies; hence too their failure to excel in speculation, whether philosophical or scientific. But hence, also, their great contribution in such practical activities as religion and law.

Lassen's account may be accepted in its general outlines, though many of his deductions and the illustrations are certainly erroneous. In particular his view of the Arab as a being in whom will predominates over intellect and emotions seems to contain an important truth.[11]

But national characteristics are not immutable, and can

[10] Quoted by Abdal-Rahman al-Badawi in *Al Ilhad fi 'l-Islam*, Cairo, 1945.

[11] It is not by accident that volition is so heavily stressed in Islamic thought. Thus according to al-Ghazali "the essential element of the soul is not the intelligence which is concerned with the bodily frame but the will: just as God is primarily known not as thought or intelligence, but as the volition which is the cause of creation (D. O'Leary, *Arabic Thought and its Place in History*, p. 221).

often be traced to some sociological factor. This is why the explanation given by Ibn Khaldun, five centuries ago, seems to us nearer the mark. In a chapter entitled "Most of the learned men in Islam have been Persians,"[12] Ibn Khaldun discusses the reasons why "the men of learning in Islam . . . have been, with but a few exceptions, Persians, those of them who were Arabs by race being foreigners in their language, their environment and their teachers. And this has occurred in spite of the fact that Islam originated as an Arab sect with an Arab founder."

His answer is that learning can develop only in a sedentary society, where the crafts enjoy a long and uninterrupted tradition and attention. Now the Arabs could not be expected to produce any learning as long as they remained nomads. "Those Arabs, however, who forsook a nomadic for a sedentary life concentrated all their *energies on politics, rulership, and war.* This bred a disdain for the pursuit of learning as a profession, since it had become one of the crafts; for the ruling classes always look down on the crafts and professions and all that pertains to them."

It was, therefore, only the non-Arab sedentary populations who could produce any learning or scholarship, such as "the Persians, or those who were politically and culturally subject to them and had, therefore, developed a skill in the sciences and crafts owing to a long tradition of civilization."

Ibn Khaldun's contention seems to be fundamentally correct. For a century and a half the Arabs were a ruling class, occupied mainly in politics and warfare. The only other activities deemed worthy of such a class were the teaching and spreading of Islam, which demanded a knowledge of language and philosophy, the administering and developing of the Law of the Prophet and, last but not least, poetry, which occupied in post-Islamic society as exalted a position as it had done in pre-Islamic times and which was intimately connected with the Court, often serving as a

[12] *Prolegomena,* Part VI, Chapter 35.

vehicle for political propaganda. Hence it was that the Arabs excelled in the above mentioned branches of activity.

Ibn Khaldun's contention may be tested by studying the position of the Roman or Latin ruling class towards the provincial populations of the Empire, after the time of Augustus. Even if the term Roman be extended so as to denote all the inhabitants of the Italian peninsula, one cannot but be struck by the predominance of non-Romans over Romans in most fields of culture.

Speaking of the last years of the Republic, Rostovtzeff states: "The Romans paid little attention to the exact and minute discoveries of Greece in mathematics, medicine, physiology, astronomy, geography and the natural sciences. But," he adds, "grammar, rhetoric, archeology, jurisprudence, philosophy, the history of religion and law—all these became favourite subjects of study with educated Romans."[13]

The first part of his statement holds true of the four or five following centuries. Wherever we look we find the only valuable work being done by non-Romans, and almost always in the Greek, not the Latin, language.

Thus in *mathematics,* there were Nicomachus of Gerasa, Menelaus of Alexandria, and in the 3rd century, the great Diophantus of Alexandria, all of whom wrote in Greek. In *astronomy,* the scene is dominated by Ptolemy (died *circa* 160 A.D.), whose work constituted the basis of all studies during the next millenium or more. Ptolemy lived in Alexandria and wrote in Greek. In *medicine,* ignoring minor figures who were practically all non-Romans from the Eastern provinces, we find Rufus of Ephesus, Soranus of Ephesus, the great Galen of Pergamum and Aretaos of Cappadocia, all of whom lived in the second century and wrote in Greek.

Finally, all the great *geographers* were non-Romans who wrote in Greek, notably Strabo of Pontus, Ptolemy and Pausanias of Lydia. The only Romans who can be said to have distinguished themselves in the sciences were Pliny,

[13] *History of the Ancient World,* Vol. II, p. 173.

Varro and the encyclopedist-physician Celsus—and all of these are relatively minor figures.

Our contention may be supported by two quotations taken from Roman writers. Thus Cicero complained that "the Greek mathematicians lead the field in pure geometry, while we limit ourselves to the practice of reckoning and measuring";[14] while Pliny reveals clearly the attitude of the Roman ruling class towards medicine. "Medicine," he says, "in spite of lucrativeness, is the one art of the Greeks that the serious Roman has so far refused to cultivate. Few of our fellow-citizens have been willing even to touch it, and if they do they desert at once to the Greeks."[15]

But even in the fields mentioned by Rostovtzeff as having interested the Romans, the contribution of the other peoples was often greater. This comes out most clearly in *philosophy,* where the only outstanding Roman name is that of Marcus Aurelius (who wrote in Greek), whereas the non-Romans include Philo the Jew, Seneca the half-Spaniard, Epictetus the Greek, Plotinus the Egyptian and Porphyry the Syrian.

The Romans on the other hand, made important contributions which almost coincide with those which were later made by the Arabs. The Roman contribution to *law* was immense, and needs no stressing. It is worth mentioning, however, that at least two of the "Five Great Jurists," Ulpian and Papinian, were Syrians connected with the law-school of Beirut.

In *literature,* especially in poetry and rhetoric the Roman contribution was overwhelming. There were absolutely no equivalents outside Italy of Virgil, Horace and Ovid, to mention only these. The non-Roman men of letters, whether writing in Latin or in Greek, were all second-rate figures, with the possible exceptions of Lucian of Samosata (Syria), and Apuleius of Madura (North Africa).

But, unlike the Arabs the Romans produced some great *historians,* notably Salust, Livy, Tacitus and Suetonius. The

[14] *The Legacy of Rome,* p. 297.
[15] *Ibid.,* p. 286.

Greek Plutarch and Arrian of Bithynia are there, however, to testify to the fact that historiography was not a Roman monopoly.

In *architecture,* too, the Roman contribution was much greater than the Arab. The work of Roman engineers and architects still stands and arouses admiration. Nor was it only in execution that the Romans excelled: they gave some original ideas of their own notably as regards the arch and vault. But here, too, much that goes under the name "Roman" must be credited to other peoples. Thus to take only one example, Apollodorus of Damascus, the architect who built Trajan's forum and triumphal arches, was a Syrian.

From this very brief sketch it will be seen that there is a close analogy between the part played by the Arabs and that played by the Romans in their respective Empires. Both supplied the political framework, the ruling class (for a century or two, after which the subject populations took power) the laws and the dominant language and literature. Latin, however, never conquered the eastern part of the Roman Empire in the way Arabic conquered Egypt, Syria and Persia, and Greek remained the language of science of the eastern half of the Mediterranean until it was supplanted by Arabic. The reason for this difference is that the Arabs made one very great contribution to their Empire which the Romans had failed to make to theirs: *religion*. For whereas the Arabs supplied the dominant religion the Romans imported their religions from the East. It is hardly necessary to point out that not only Mithraism and Manichaeanism but also Christianity were purely oriental products. As regards Christianity, of all the Church Fathers up to the time of St. Augustine, only St. Ambrose and St. Jerome could be said to be Roman in any sense, and only they wrote in Latin.

It is this religious contribution which makes the work of the Arabs in a way more impressive than that of the Romans. True, the Romans welded their Empire into a unit which was incomparably tighter and more homogeneous than the Arab Empire. But it is doubtful whether even the excellence of the Roman roads and administration, as well

as the spread of the Latin tongue, would have allowed that unity to survive the barbarian invasions had it not been for the spread of Christianity. Christianity preserved the unity of the West just as Islam preserved that of the East. But, once more, Christianity was not a Roman product while Islam was an Arab product.

It only remains, to point out, in conclusion, that the comparison of the part played by the Arabs and Romans does not give an answer to the question as to whether it was racial or sociological factors that determined the nature of their roles. For, on the one hand, it may be claimed that the Romans, like the Arabs, founded and maintained an empire because they were a practical, unimaginative and unspeculative race; while on the other hand it may be claimed with equal justice that the Romans, like the Arabs, constituted a ruling class and, therefore, engaged only in those activities which were directly connected with government, leaving speculation to the subject populations. The problem involved is a very deep and complex one, whose solution does not seem within sight at the present stage of knowledge.

The answer to the question set out at the beginning of this article is now clear. Islamic, like western and unlike Greek, civilization was not the work of one single people, but rather the result of the combined efforts of many. Of these the Arabs played a leading part, which is best compared to that of the Romans after the first century B.C. We can speak of "Arab civilization" with more justice than of "Roman civilization," but the term "Islamic civilization" seems better, even though non-Muslims played an important part in it, being more comprehensive and indicating more clearly the link that held that civilization together.

C. Issawi

Beirut, Lebanon

THE STRUCTURE OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ISLAM

III. Law and Theology

The Qur'an, as the previous essay in this series sought to show, is the record of the intuitive experience of Muhammad on the one hand, and on the other the fountain to which the Muslim returns again and again to refresh his spiritual vision. From the historical angle, no doubt, it is to be regarded as the source from which all subsequent Islamic ethics and theology were drawn. But true though this statement is, it is rather a simplification of the truth. In matters of faith and belief the Qur'an contains no philosophic or organized exposition. What it does is to transform religious thinking by setting new ideals before it and supplying for its contemplation new realities and new symbols, and to redirect the religious life by setting new objectives before it and supplying new channels for its practical activities. But the end still remains the intuitive experience to which the Qur'an bears witness, and the relations of that experience to the data of the practical intelligence or reason is not yet a problem.

It was some time, in fact, before it became a problem. The first questions and difficulties with which the growing Muslim community was faced as it began to absorb numbers of adherents of widely-differing spiritual and intellectual capacities (a process which, it must be remembered, began already in Medina) were not dogmatic and theological, but practical. They were problems of personal relationships within the new organized society, which was gaining and continued to gain what was, from the religious point of view, an even embarrassing success. They were, in a word, ethical problems.

It was now that the rituals and 'acts of devotion' which were prescribed in the Qur'an proved their value. By their rigid and compulsory character they provided a social, as well as religious, steelframe. Their observance was the external sign of membership of the Muslim community, and

to observe them called for not only social, but also self-discipline. During its first century the Muslim religious community presents in general the features of an ethical society; it is little troubled with theological questions, and its saints are ascetics, not seers. It is remarkable to observe how much of this has survived as a permanent element in Islam and remains to this day characteristic of Muslim societies, particularly those whose Muslim consciousness is heightened by contrast with neighbouring non-Muslim societies.

The term 'ethical society' must not, however, be misunderstood. Its ethics are still revealed ethics, not the product of rational speculations or of social experience. Their authority and validity are derived from the belief that they conform to the will of an all-controlling personal God, the motive behind them is ideally one of religious devotion, their sanctions are supernatural and eschatological. It was only gradually, and rather sporadically, that the influence of social pressures came in to reinforce them against the lax or the non-conforming.

The fact that the source of Muslim ethics was religious intuition, transmitting a divine revelation to mankind, was all-important also for the structure of Muslim society. Viewed in the light of the ultimate principle which regulates human existence, all human institutions take on a new significance. They are not immaterial to the religious life; they either express or do not express the Will of God for men, and they either conduce or do not conduce to a life of true submission to God.

The priority of these practical ethical questions over the problems presented by the speculative reason is shown already by the Qur'an, which lays down rules, sometimes in great detail, for the fundamental institutions of society, such as marriage, kinship, inheritance, economic activity, warfare. Since the Quranic precepts fell far short of sufficing for all the problems which arose in community life, the need to supplement them from some authoritative source was met, as is well known, by recourse to the *Ḥadith*. The demands which the social problems of an ethical society

made upon the example of its founder were, indeed, almost inexhaustible, and led to the expansion, multiplication and production of traditions on a wide scale. But there was no escape from this. It was felt to be indispensable that the public life of the Muslim community—in so far as it was, or was to be made, truly Muslim—should rest upon the Qur'an, as interpreted through and expanded by the sayings credibly attributed to the Prophet. So deep and strong was this conviction that to define explicitly the ethics, norms and usages of public life became, after the salvation of their own souls, the chief occupation of the religious leaders of the community, and it was the product of their insight (*fiqh*) that furnished the materials of Islamic Law.

Islamic Law is the typical product of an ethical society. In principle—and in practice also at the outset—it is not distinguished from doctrine. It is only at a later stage that they diverge, the one, as theology, to set out the logical and philosophical arguments for monotheism, the other, as law, to define or lay down its practical consequences in the way of *duties*. This is a first characteristic feature of Islamic Law, that it is a doctrine of duties and that the duties of which it takes cognizance are of two kinds: duties towards God (right belief and the observance of the acts of religious obligation) and duties towards one's fellowmen. But since the latter also are laid down by God, either explicitly or implicitly, there is no real distinction between them.

Again, it is characteristic of the practical function and non-speculative origin of Islamic Law that the jurists are little interested in general principles. The foundation of the Law was the body of concrete obligations declared in the Qur'an. On this foundation and with the aid of the materials incorporated in the *Ḥadith*, the business of the legist was to draw out the rules of conduct, public and private (as we should say), but exclusively in similar concrete terms. After examination of each specific case, its ethical category was determined in terms of the five-degree scale of ethico-religious values: obligatory, recommended, permitted or neutral, disapproved, forbidden.

A third significant feature is that for the first three centuries this task of legal definition and classification absorbed the intellectual energies of the Muslim community to an unparalleled degree. Not only theologians, traditionists and practical administrators, but also philologists, historians, men of letters, contributed their quota to the corpus of legal literature and the discussion of legal issues. Seldom, if ever, has law penetrated so deeply into the life and thought of a community as it did in the early Muslim civilization.

So intense a concentration of thought inevitably produced disputes over details and sometimes over major issues that were bitter and prolonged. But through all this the Qur'an exerted a steadying and moderating influence; face to face with its authority no private opinion could be maintained as absolutely valid. All were plainly subordinate to a supreme Power, and the fact of common allegiance to that Power made all but extreme fanatics conscious of their community. Even sectarian divisions arising out of political and theological differences did not disturb the basic unity of legal attitudes and methods. Although at a later stage Shi'ite law diverged from Sunni norms to some extent, Sunni and Shi'ite jurists are scarcely to be distinguished in the early centuries. It was this sense of unity, based upon the Qur'an, in all the things that mattered most which led the great majority of Muslims firstly to that remarkable compromise, the toleration of differences in matters of detail, and finally to the realization that where a community is united on the main issues, the existence of differences is an enrichment of community life, to be accepted with gratitude as one of God's *barakāt*. And conversely, it was the rejection of this community-consciousness which led the Shi'a into sterile opposition.

It is almost impossible to overestimate the influence on Muslim religious thought of this legal activity. Once the science and structure of law were established, they not only supplied a rigid frame for the Muslim ideals of ethical duty and human relations (with the slight element of flexibility allowed by the four schools), but the Law itself, the *Sharī'a*,

defined once and for all the constitution of the Muslim Community. The *Sharī'a* to the Muslim stands for all that the Constitution stands for to the United States of America, and more. It established norms for all Muslim institutions and societies, which have ever since remained the sheet-anchor of Muslim culture through the many and terrible vicissitudes of later centuries; it expressed and went far to creating a united Muslim community, in spite of political fragmentation and conflict; and it is still, notwithstanding all the criticisms of Muslim modernists and reformers, the sole embodiment of what would otherwise be a merely formal unity of faith amongst all Muslims.

The very immensity of this task of creating and establishing such a unity of law and community of culture required the dedication to it of a large proportion of the vital energies of the community. It constituted, without doubt, the greatest challenge to the Muslim civilization, and also its greatest achievement, however incomplete. It involved its leaders in a long and severe struggle to eliminate all conflicting legal systems and customary usages amongst the wide range of peoples who entered the *Dār al-Islām,* a struggle in which they enjoyed only limited support from their temporal rulers and not even always the support of their religious organizations, as we shall see in the following essay. It was a task never fully accomplished. From the very first, the *Sharī'a,* as administered in the Muslim states, was modified (or, in the eyes of the pious, adulterated) by the addition or substitution of administrative rulings, and at the present day it is menaced by the growth and expansion of western codes and courts of law. Yet, just as the peoples of Western Christendom always acknowledged a moral law, though they might not always observe it, so all orthodox Muslims regard the *Sharī'a* as setting the perfect standard for human society, although their own practice may fall short of it.

To reject the Sharī'a *in principle* is therefore in some sense apostasy, a fact which explains the shock felt by Muslims all over the world by the action of the Turkish Repub-

lic in abolishing the *Sharī'a* outright. And it is probably a true conviction, if still an intuitive one, that respect for the *Sharī'a* (which need not necessarily imply respect for each and every one of the mediaeval interpretations and constructions) remains the core of Muslim social thinking, and that with the maintenance of the *Sharī'a* is linked the survival or disappearance of Islam as an organized system.

The same practical outlook and dislike or suspicion of intellectual subtlety characterized the evolution of orthodox theology. But again one must be on one's guard against misconceptions. The danger of intellectual subtlety lies not in the use of the intelligence, but in the abuse of it. More especially it may lead to self-confidence or to simple surrender to the pleasure of intellectual exercise, and both are forms of infidelity. The one is irreconcilable with the Muslim duty of humility before God, the second converts thinking about God into a kind of sport.

These dangers were brought home to the orthodox leaders in a peculiarly vivid and direct way during the first and second centuries. Professor Tritton's chapter on the early sects in his work on *Muslim Theology* gives a striking picture of the incredible confusion, multiplicity, and often absurdity of the ideas which were ventilated when Islam emerged into the clamour of the Hellenistic world and found itself enveloped in an atmosphere of theological controversy. The only way to keep one's feet and one's faith was to fall back on the Qur'an and reject all intellectual constructions with a *bilā kaif*. Nothing perhaps demonstrates more decisively the degree to which the Qur'an had already gripped and moulded the Muslim mind than the observation that throughout this critical period the great body of the community never seems to have wavered. There is a saying quoted by Professor Tritton and attributed to 'Āmir ash-Sha'bī which sums up, with deep feeling and insight, the position and duty of the true Muslim: "Love an upright Muslim and an upright man of the Banū Hāshim, but be not a Shī'ī; hope for what you do not know, but be not a Murji'; know that good comes from God and evil

from the self, but be not a Qadarī; love all whom you see doing good, even a slit-eared Sindī."

Moreover, the time was not yet ripe for theology. It is the simple truth that the intuitive type of mind is incapable of rational theologizing. Before a Muslim theology, in the strict sense, could be elaborated, it was necessary for some Muslims, at least, to learn logic and philosophy; and the habit of philosophical discourse is not learned in one day or one generation. Orthodox theology therefore began, as one would expect, by simple protest against or negation of heretical views, or simple statement of orthodox views on disputed questions, without adducing any arguments at all. Indeed, the earliest compendium of orthodox positions explicitly asserts the intuitive as against the theological approach: "Insight (*fiqh*) in matters of religion is better than insight in matters of knowledge and law" (Wensinck, *The Muslim Creed,* p. 104).

But this position was radically altered by the sweeping movement of Aristotelianism which is associated with the rise of Mu'tazilite theology. The story of the refusal of the orthodox at first to enter the lists, and of their subsequent change of attitude and the victory of their Ash'arite and Māturīdite champions, is too well known to need repetition. I suspect that it was not quite so simple an affair as it is often represented; there was a whole century of hard thinking behind it, though, even so, the victory was won not by the side that had the strongest philosophical position, but by the side whose logical arguments reflected the overwhelming mass of public opinion.

From this evolution of orthodox theology followed several important consequences, whose effects were felt through the whole range of Islamic thought, religious and non-religious, and persist in Islam down to the present day. The first arises from the fact that theology is, in its own field, a scientific discipline, working with rational concepts and using scientific tools, namely logic and physics. This in itself put an end to all that swarming of fantastic ideas which had preceded the formulation of the orthodox theology. It

was not that the orthodox theology killed them; it was the discipline of thought behind it that drove them out and made it impossible for such fantasies ever to appear again in Muslim religious thinking. The intuitive imagination was at last balanced and corrected by a rational understanding of the universe and, as I have pointed out elsewhere, Islam came to terms with scientific method and modes of thought.

In the second place, and most significantly for the future of Islam, this rationalization of thought in matters of religion (which was only one aspect of a general rationalization of thought in all departments of Muslim culture) was based upon Aristotelian foundations. This meant that intellectual life in Islam came to rest upon the same foundations as the intellectual life of the western world, as distinct from the foundations of Indian or Chinese thought. The fact of Quranic monotheism and its relations to Jewish and Christian monotheism had no doubt given Islam a certain bias in this direction, but this in itself would not have been enough to create an identity of logical reasoning. As important, however, as the fact of the original Aristotelian impact is the further fact that its incorporation in Islamic theology maintained a rational core of thought in face of this reaction and through the succeeding period of cultural decay. Consequently, it is largely due to the labours of Muslim theologians that in its basic reasoning processes Islam as a whole stands on the same side of the watershed as the west. There is no need to point out how greatly this has facilitated the interchange of ideas between the two civilizations both in the Middle Ages and in modern times.

A third consequence was that the theological system formulated with the aid of Aristotelian logic, because it was founded on a scientific discipline, remained remarkably stable and showed itself capable of withstanding all the pressures of sufistic and animistic impulses in later centuries. If the Qur'an was and is the living heart of Islam, the theology of the scholastics, backed by Islamic Law, constituted its backbone. However weakened it seemed to be at times by compromise with sufistic and pantheistic tendencies, it

never abandoned its central positions and always in the end reasserted the supremacy of its transcendentalist doctrine. It is probable, for example, that it was only the firm opposition of theology that prevented the universal devotion to Muhammad from passing into adoration and worship. It is certain that it was only because of the clear and firm limits set by theology that the emotional and imaginative exuberance of later Sufism was disciplined and furnished with a positive religious content. When one looks back at the fantasies of early sectarian thinking and imagines what might have happened had the Sufi movement arisen directly out of that stage of thought, one can measure what Islam and the world owe to the Mu'tazila and al-Ash'arī.

Important, however, as were these historical consequences, it is perhaps more relevant to the subject of this paper to appreciate the effects upon Islamic theology itself, and upon its function in the living structure of Muslim religious thought, of the principles upon which the system was elaborated. The central doctrine of the Qur'an is, of course, an uncompromising unitarianism. At the same time that it rejects the animism of the Arabs, the Qur'an rejects the conception of mediators between God and man, at least in this world. "In thus setting man as it were face to face with God, without any mediating spiritual or personal elements, Islam necessarily emphasized the contrast between God and man. In spite of the passages of mystical intuition in the Qur'an, the dogmatic derived from it could not but start from the postulate of the opposition between God and man, and (as a necessary corollary) the equality of all men in their creaturely relation to God. In this stark contrast lies, indeed, the religious tension which is the characteristic original feature of Islam."[1]

But the contrast might have become less absolute in Islamic theology had not Muslim Aristotelianism stopped short at logic and physics. *Arabic* Aristotelianism went on into metaphysics, but not *Muslim* rationalism. This is not difficult to understand. Monotheism of any kind raises grave

[1] Quoted from the forthcoming volume on *Mohammedanism* in the Home University Library.

philosophical difficulties, and the more absolute the monotheism the more difficult they become to resolve. Perhaps, indeed, the structure of philosophical thought which Islam and Europe alike inherited from the Greeks can never supply a completely adequate or even consistent metaphysical explanation of monotheism. But leaving that aside, it seems clear that the Muslim theologians, as soon as they realized where philosophy, in the strict sense, might lead them, drew back. Consequently, Muslim scholasticism is almost exclusively logical; it never attacks the real philosophical problems; and, lacking that leaven of philosophic scepticism which restrains an excessive reliance upon logic, developed the doctrine of 'difference' to the limits of negation.

On the philosophical level there would always have remained some doubts as to the absolute sufficiency of any given postulate. In more modern expression we should recognize that in every verbalization of an idea there is an element of metaphor or symbolism which, when dragged this way and that by the permutations and combinations of syllogistic reasoning, may ultimately lead to absurd conclusions. But a theologian is, almost by definition, a person who accepts as positive realities the symbols in which any religious experience has been verbalized. And for the Muslim theologians this tendency was strengthened by the doctrine that the Qur'an was the very Word of God, and hence exempt from the limitations attaching to human speech. Given then the Quranic conception of God as Absolute Will in activity, and the Quranic statements as absolute postulates, the theology worked out with the aid of Greek logic and physics could not but stress the unimaginable transcendence of God. The slightly more philosophical Mu'tazila had attempted to introduce a moderating element of Greek rationalism, but in reaction against them the orthodox refused to admit of any limitations whatsoever upon the power and will of God, or that terms derived from human experience were applicable to Him.

Islamic theology is thus always forced into extreme positions. There can be no agent of any kind in the universe

except God, since the existence of an agent implies the possibility of an action independent of God, and therefore a theoretical limitation on the absolute Power of God. Nothing is therefore positively related to any other thing; all relationships are momentary and fleeting creations. There can be no stable universe of matter, only a multitude of atoms of space and of time, ceaselessly created and annihilated by the Will of God. There can be no causation in the strict sense, no necessary relation between something that goes before and another thing that comes after. As for ethics, nothing is incumbent upon God; our concepts are quite irrelevant to Him. He rewards and punishes as He wills and cannot be called to account.

This is not the place to attempt an analysis of Islamic theology; in any case, no simplified outlines could do any sort of justice to the voluminous, learned, and acute Muslim theological literature of the Middle Ages or of more recent times. But in attempting to estimate its function in the living religious thought of Muslims, we are faced with the problem, on which I have insisted elsewhere, of the relations between outer formulation and inner function or reality in the Islamic system. Since the two are seldom identical, we are constantly involved in a search for the clues which will allow us to penetrate even a little way below the first to the second, and to discover how they complement or correct one another.

Nowhere is this more necessary than in the field of doctrinal formulations. Sometimes, however, the theologians themselves supply the positive correction to their fundamentally negative dogmas. In the matter of causation, for example, they qualify the negation of necessary causation by asserting that in the manifestations of God's creative will there is a certain order and regularity. The Qur'an appeals frequently to God's 'custom' (*sunna*) and asserts that there is no change to be found in it. Consequently, man is enabled to forecast the normal sequences of events which follow upon given actions, even if they may not strictly be called consequences.

Similarly, the doctrine of 'acquisition' (*kasb*) looks very like an attempt to sidestep the dilemma which resulted from pressing the doctrine of predestination to its 'logical conclusion.' What it means, if I have understood it correctly, is that although everything *is* predestined and man has no power of action, yet psychologically he feels in himself a power of choice and so 'acquires' the responsibility. Such an argument suggests that the theologians themselves were uneasy at times about the positions to which they were committed by their own methods of reasoning.

If these examples may be used to draw a general conclusion, the relationship between formulation and function would appear to be somewhat as follows. The orthodox doctrine, in its theological formulation, is the conclusion of a purely logical argument from the theoretical premise that no limitation can be placed upon the power of God. But it is not in itself the determinant of Muslim belief. It only gives a theoretical and rigid expression to the already existing *dominant* tendency both in those passages of the Qur'an which refer to the subject under discussion and in the intuitive apprehension of Muslims. That is to say it is itself determined by the prevailing trend of Muslim feeling.

At the same time, however, the attempt to rationalize this feeling or belief not only exaggerates it, but ultimately even deforms it, because it leaves out of sight or discards altogether certain elements which, in the Qur'an or in the intuitive apprehension of the community, are simultaneously present, although subordinate. The dogma of predestination, for example, has to override the quite explicit affirmations of free-will in the Qur'an, which, although definitely subordinated to the prevalent assertion of predestination, yet represent a valid element in religious experience. Hence the theological doctrine in general represents and sustains a dominant intellectual or intuitive attitude, which in the practice of the community is modified by the survival of the submerged idea and its continued influence.

The conclusion so derived from the analysis of particular statements of dogma may be applied in fine to the whole

structure of dogmatic theology. Logically and syntactically unassailable, it remains a fixed and permanent element in the Muslim religious consciousness, sustaining, reinforcing, and, if need be, enforcing the conviction of the Oneness and absolute Power of God. To be sure, its direct effect, as in every theological system, is greater upon the thought of the religious leaders than upon the thought of the general community, but its influence, mediated through 'ulamā, preachers, and teachers, affects and directs the religious attitudes of all faithful Muslims.

Yet, because of its ruthless logical development of the doctrine of 'difference,' it stood opposed to the spirit and meaning of those passages in the Qur'an which speak of the mystic indwelling of God in the universe and in man. The religious attitudes which it fostered were characterized more by dogmatism and intellectual conformity than by inner conviction sustained by the intuitive vision of the unseen called out by the Qur'an in the hearts of pious Muslims. By eliminating any relation between God and man, it dammed up the springs of religious experience. So monstrous an exaggeration, for all the rightness of its postulates, could not but evoke protest. The personal intuitive experience, fortified by the Qur'an, refused to be crushed out of existence and maintained, with steadily increasing vigour, the validity of the intuitive as against the rational and logical interpretation of religion. From this protest arose the Sufi movement.

H. A. R. Gibb

St. John's College, Oxford

A BRITISH MUSEUM ARABIC ESCHATOLOGICAL FRAGMENT

An interesting Arabic eschatological fragment exists in the British Museum. This MS. (Or. 11851. P28580 folios 15a-19b) consists of 5 folios (recto and verso) in a codex said to be c. 14th century. The eschatological section consists of 197 lines, 21 lines to the page, on the average; the first page has only 9 lines including the title. The MS. is vocalized here and there in a desultory fashion. Sometimes we have pointing where it is rather unnecessary, whereas on more ambiguous forms we have no help. The script is in a fairly easy hand, but the consonantal diacritical points are often lacking.

The MS. purports to be an excerpt from *Kitāb al-Mu'ānasa fī Ḥusn al-Mujālasa,* by al-Ḥarīrī, a work which apparently has not come down to us. On the face of it, it is unlikely to be the same al-Ḥarīrī[1] of *Maqāma* fame. The work appears to be the Arabic equivalent of a Midrash on the Quranic verse (Sūra 28:88) that everything is perishable (*hālik*) except His countenance; or rather it may be based on Sūra 55:26,27, "Everyone upon it is transient (*fānin*), but the face of thy Lord, endowed with majesty and honour, shall endure," since the root *fanā* and *fanā' al-ashyā'* seems to form the basis of the Midrash. The whole of this little MS. is greatly indebted to the Qur'ān; sometimes the language echoes that of the Qur'ān, often snippets of verses from the Qur'ān are worked into the tradition. In the notes an attempt has been made to set down as exhaustively as possible such points of indebtedness.

At the same time one would venture to suggest that our MS. may be not merely an amplification of Sūra 55:26, but rather that that Quranic verse provided an excuse for introducing into Muslim eschatology a feature to be found in at least one form of early Jewish eschatology. Our fragment describes the world when man and beast are dead. Before the Resurrection can come, the spirits of the mountains, the spirits of the trees, springs and seas must die. Stripped of

everything the world (*dunyā*—the Earth) too must die; though in this case the Angel of Death has to have the help of Gibrīl, Mīkā'īl and Isrāfīl to destroy the world and collect its soul. The death of Jinn and angels is not described, but from all the angelic host only 'Izrā'īl, Gibrīl, Mīkā'īl and Isrāfīl remain. 'Izrā'īl, the Angel of Death, is commanded to take the souls of the Archangels in the following order, Gibrīl, Mīka'īl and Isrāfīl. 'Izrā'īl at God's command, himself dies, and only God remains.After a period of unstated duration in which God exists alone, He will awaken Isrāfīl to inaugurate the resurrection with his Trumpet blast.

This picture of the reversal of things before the new creation, though not carried so far, nor in such detail, meets us in IV Ezra VII, 27-31, "And whosoever is delivered from the predicted evils, the same shall see my wonders. For my Son the Messiah shall be revealed, together with those who are with him, and shall rejoice the survivors four hundred years. And it shall be after these years, that my Son the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath. *Then shall the world be turned into the primaeval silence seven days, like as at the first beginnings;* so that no man is left. And it shall be after seven days that the Age which is not yet awake shall be roused, and that which is corruptible shall perish" (Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,* Vol. II, p. 582). But nothing is mentioned in IV Ezra VII:30, of the destruction of the world, and its mountains, springs, seas, etc., nor of the death of even the archangels.

A striking parallel to our fragment is to be found in *Kitāb Aḥwāl al-Qiyāma* in the section *fī dhikr Fanā' al-Ashyā'*.[2] The scene set for the action here is the same as in our MS. Men and beasts are dead, trees and rivers and plants; the world is empty. But that is not enough for "Everything is evanescent except His Countenance." It is noteworthy that this same Quranic verse is here also the text for the midrashic development. The sea gives up his spirit first of the natural order; the mountains succumb

next at the Angel of Death's command. The earth 'arḍ) itself must die. Each in turn bewails its fate as in our MS. A new touch occurs in Wolff's MS., for at the death of the earth, sun, moon and stars are scattered. Then in their turn, Gibrīl, Mīkā'īl, Isrāfīl and the Bearers of the Throne, at the command of God, give up their souls apparently simultaneously to the Angel of Death. Finally the Angel of Death ('Izrā'īl is here not mentioned by name) succumbs to God Himself.

This account is clearly in some way related to our fragment; which is the earlier version is impossible to say; whether our MS. contains an expansion of the tradition found in the brief chapter in the work edited by Wolff, or the latter is a résumé of the account in our fragment one would like to know. Perhaps the first possibility is likelier. However the relation between these two accounts must not be pressed too far. There are significant differences in the order of the annihilation of the elements; there are, too, differences to some extent in vocabulary.

It is unfortunate that Wolff was apparently unable to come to any conclusion about the date or origin of the *Kitāb Aḥwāl al-Qiyāma.*

It is significant that in the text edited by Wolff in his *Muhammedanische Eschatologie* the names of Ka'b al-Aḥbār, and his famous pupil Ibn 'Abbās are mentioned frequently (to say nothing of his other pupil Abū Hurairah). The name of 'Abdallah ibn Salām is to be found too, e.g. p. 69, as the deliverer of information on the angel Rūmān. The legend in our MS. claims to stem from Ka'b; 'Abdallah ibn Salām and Ibn 'Abbās occur in connection with it. It is true however that in the parallel section in Wolff's *Muhammedanische Eschatologie* the name of no "Tradent" is given, though these names occur in connection with other sections.

Ka'b al-Aḥbār, or to give him his full name, Abū Isḥāq Ka'b b. Māti' b. Haisu (d. 32 or 35 A.H.), had been a Yemenite Jew. Among the Muslims he was known as al-Aḥbār on account of his Biblical learning. One suspects

that that title, recognized as equivalent to the Rabbinic Ḥaber, may well have been his while still a Jew. It is generally agreed that Ka'b al-Aḥbār brought in many elements of Jewish Haggada into Islam. It would seem likely in view of the nature of the tradition ascribed to him in our fragment (as well as the traditions associated with his name in Wolff's collection), that he is to be credited with developing Muslim eschatology along lines with which he as a former Jew would be familiar. Even if this is not the case, it did not seem absurd to the inventors of such traditions of an eschatological nature to associate them with his name.

The occasion of Ka'b's delivering himself of this tradition, as given in the opening lines of our MS., is in keeping with what we know from Ṭabarī (*Annales,* I, 2946 sq.) of Ka'b. Ka'b was a consistent supporter of 'Uthmān. If by "the time of his confinement" (*waqt ḥaṣānihi*) is meant the siege of 'Uthmān's house in Medina prior to his assassination, then the setting is unhistorical, for Ka'b according to Ṭabarī (*Annales,* III, 2474 sq.) predeceased 'Uthmān, dying in Syria in 32 or 34 A.H. We know that 'Abdallah b. Salām, mentioned in our MS. as present in 'Uthmān's house with Ka'b and the others, did help 'Uthmān against his enemies (Tir. 44, sūra 46 t.i; 46:36). An-Nawawī (Wüstenfeld's edition p. 347) tells us that 'Abdallah b. Salām b. al-Ḥārith had been an Israelite. This Anṣārī, whether he ever influenced or not, any of the Medinan Sūras, is very important in the formation of the *Ḥādīth,* and undoubtedly seems to have put into the Prophet's mouth in *Ḥadīth,* material from Rabbinic sources.

Sahl b. Ka'b b. Mūsā would appear to have been of Jewish origin too.

Salmān al-Fārisī, famous for the high importance assigned to him among the Shī'is and Ṣūfis, was a companion of the prophet, who had had Christian instruction after leaving home as a youth. In his travels through Central Arabia he was sold by the Beduin to a Jew, by whom he was brought to Medina. On his conversion to Islam he acquired his liberty. His contacts with Christian monks and a Jewish

master may not be without significance for his interest in eschatology. Nor should his Zoroastrian background be forgotten. Salmān al-Fārisī was still alive till towards the end of 'Uthmān's caliphate. The date of his death is uncertain; it is not impossible, as our MS. suggests, that he was closely associated with 'Uthmān during his confinement in his house.

'Abdallah b. 'Abbās, who is mentioned in our MS. as having been so impressed by this teaching of Ka'b's as to go into a decline, managed however to survive till at least 68 A.H. He was a cousin of the Prophet, but much his junior, being born only two years before the Hijra. F. Buhl (*Enc. Islam.* art. on 'Abdallah b. 'Abbās) points out that he was just coming into prominence under 'Uthmān, who we are told made him leader of the Pilgrimage in 35 A.H. He was absent from Medina when 'Uthmān was murdered. 'Abdallah b. 'Abbās like his teacher Ka'b b. Māti' is dignified with the title of Ḥaber; in Ibn 'Abbās' case, its actual form is *Ḥibr al-Umma,* so renowned was he for his traditions. There is no doubt that he was indebted to Ka'b for Jewish Haggadic teachings. Our MS. would seem to give a true picture of how impressed he was by Ka'b's teachings, for in Wolff's *Muhammedanische Eschatologie* we have frequent traditions by Ibn 'Abbās which testify to his interest in Angelology and Eschatology.

Whether such a tradition[3] as we have here in our MS. actually goes back to Ka'b al-Aḥbār or not, it would seem likely that when once men began to comment on the Qur'ān (as indeed Ibn 'Abbās is said to have done), any passages seemingly relating to the End would be amplified into what would grow into an Eschatological system. The presence too of Jewish converts in Medina, such as Ka'b al-Aḥbār, would in turn lead to easy transplanting of the exotic angelology and eschatology of Judaism in the receptive soil of Islam.

One ventures to suggest that the unsettled caliphate of 'Uthmān might have led more deeply religious souls into the frame of mind which concentrated on the Other World and the End of things, rather than on the Present. Even if

not true of Muslims in general, it would not be surprising if 'Uthmān and his close friends might when he was besieged, lose zest for this life and concentrate on meditating on the Final Drama. In so far as this seems likely, the author of this tradition, whatever be his date, has given a convincing setting for the teaching which he puts into Ka'b's mouth.

What would argue for a late date however is the prominent role of Isrāfīl, whose name is found neither in the Qur'ān nor in Tradition but only in the later literature.

Notes on *The Archangels in Islam*

Gibrīl is mentioned by name in the Qur'ān in Sūras 66:4, 2:91, 2:92. In addition he is supposed to be referred to in Sūras 2:81, 254, 5:109, 16:104, as the 'Holy Spirit'; in Sūra 26:193, as the 'Faithful Spirit; and in Sūra 53:5, as the 'one terrible in power." Gibrīl of course is famous in Islam as the bearer of God's Revelation to Muḥammad, though he is also credited with having brought assistance or revelations to most of the prophets and patriarchs. Despite Sūra 2:92, Gibrīl overshadows Mīkā'īl in Islam as the peculiar guardian of the Faithful. According to the commentaries, e.g., Baiḍāwī on Sūra 2,92, Gibrīl is on God's right and Mīkā'īl on His left. The order is reversed in Jewish Haggada *Shema' Israel* (Jellinek *Bet Hammidrash* V. 166). Again in Jewish Midrash (cf. *Num. R.* II, 10) Michael is on the right, Uriel on the left, Gabriel in front and Raphael behind the Throne.

Ibn 'Abbās in Wolff's *Muhammedanische Eschatologie,* p. 15, informs us: "As for Gibrīl (on him be peace) God (Exalted is He) created him 500 years after Mīkā'īl" (who was created 500 hundred years after Isrāfīl) "and he has 1600 wings, and from his head to his feet hairs of saffron and a sun is between his eyes and on every hair is a moon and stars. And every day he enters into a sea of light 360 times and when he comes out he drops from his wings a thousand thousand drops; and God creates from every drop an angel in the likeness of Gibrīl. They praise God until the day of the Resurrection, and their names are the Spiritual Beings."

Mīkā'īl (so MS.) is mentioned by name in the Qur'ān only in Sūra 2:92. The Quranic form of the name is Mīkāl. Mīkā'īl according to Ibn 'Abbās (Wolff, *ibid.* p. 13), is over the rain and the means of sustaining life (*ṣāḥib al-'amṭār wa'l-'arzāq*). Michael is called by Daniel XII, 1, "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people." In Jewish Haggada Gabriel is somewhat inferior in power to Michael (cf. *Ber.* 4b), for while Michael can

reach the earth in one flight, Gabriel needs two. In *T. B. Hag.* 12b. we are told that the Zebul (the fourth heaven) is that in which are the heavenly Jerusalem and the Temple, "and the altar is built there, and Michael the great prince stands and offers upon it an offering."

Mīkā'īl is mentioned very rarely in Ḥadīth compared with Gibrīl, and obviously yields first place in importance to Gibrīl.

Wensinck (*Enc. Islam,* "Mīkāl") says, "Perhaps a faint recollection of Michael as the protector of mankind (The Jews, The Christians) may be found in the tradition according to which Michael has never laughed since the creation of Hell (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, III, 224)." Yet Ibn 'Abbās (Wolff, *Muh. Eschat.*) is credited with believing that Mīkā'īl beseeches God for the forgiveness of the sins of the Faithful, pp. 14-15. "And as for Mīkā'īl (upon him be peace) God (to Him belong glory and power) created him 500 years after Isrāfīl" (who was interestingly enough according to this tradition created first of the Archangels).

"And from his (Mīkā'īl's) head to his feet he has hairs of saffron and wings of green smaragd; and on every hair are a thousand thousand faces, and on every face a thousand thousand mouths, and in every mouth a thousand thousand tongues, and on every tongue a thousand languages beg God's pardon (for sins). And in every face a thousand thousand eyes weep with every eye; by them he beseeches mercy on those of the Faithful who committed offences. And he drops from every eye a thousand drops, and He (exalted is He) has created from every drop an angel after the likeness of Mīkā'īl (on him be peace). They praise God until the Day of the Resurrection, and their names are the Cherubim and they are the helpers of Mīkā'īl, set over the rain, and the plants and the means of livelihood and the fruits. And there is no drop in the seas and no fruit on the trees, and no plants on the earth but has an angel set over it."

Isrāfīl: the name is not found in the Qur'ān nor in any corpus of *Ḥadīth* proper. Isrāfīl reads out God's decrees from the Tablet. If Mīkā'īl has not laughed since Hell was created, Isrāfīl does more, he weeps violently three times by day and three times by night, when he looks into Hell. Like the Angel of Death, he is of colossal size. Isrāfīl is known as the Lord of the Trumpet, as he it is who will blow the blast on the Day of Resurrection. To be ready, he keeps the Trumpet continually at his lips. In the Jewish Midrash *Othōth ha-Mashiaḥ* it is Michael who will blow the Trumpet as the signal for the dead to rise (Jellinek, B.H., II. 61-62).

We may quote Ibn 'Abbās' description of Isrāfīl, as given in Wolff (*ibid,* pp. 13-14):

Ibn 'Abbās said, "Isrāfīl asked God that He should give him power over the seven heavens, and He gave him it. And (he asked for) power over the seven earths, and He gave him it. And (he asked for) power over the winds, and He gave him it. And (he asked for) power over men and genii, and He gave him it. And (he asked for) power over wild beasts, and He gave him it. And from his feet to his head he has hairs and mouths and tongues covered with wings; and he has a thousand tongues. With his tongues he praises God in a thousand thousand languages, and from every breath of his, God creates an angel. They praise God until the Day of Resurrection, and they are the angels near God and the Bearers of the Throne and the noble scribes, and they are after the likeness of Isrāfīl. And Isrāfīl looks every day and every night three times into Gehinnom and he melts (in tears) and becomes like the string of a bow; and he weeps sore and he makes humble entreaties (to God); and had not God (exalted is He) prevented his weeping and his tears from filling the Earth with his tears, then it would have become like the Flood of Noah (on him be peace). And so great is he that had the water of all the seas and rivers been poured on his head, not a drop had fallen on the Earth."

In this tradition Isrāfīl is obviously regarded as pre-eminent among the Archangels; indeed Ibn 'Abbās (cf. Wolff, *ibid.* pp. 13-14), gives his description of him before that of Mīkā'īl, Gibrīl, and the Angel of Death.

The name Isrāfīl seems clearly to have been borrowed from Jewish sources, and to be equivalent to Saraphiel, Prince of the Seraphs. In Judaism the four Archangels about God's throne are Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, Raphael. Saraphiel is not usually mentioned along with them; however Reuben Margoliouth in his *Malake Elyon* p. 197 cites from the Jerusalem edition of *Bereshith Rabbati,* a haggadic story where Saraphiel is closely associated with Gabriel, Michael and the Angel of Death. The account seems worth translating in full:

"The Holy One, Blessed be He, showed Adam the seed of his seed to the end of their generations. There came before his eyes the likeness of David the son of Jesse, King of Israel. Adam saw that the way of piety was in him. He said to the Holy One, Blessed be He, 'What a name and what a fate and way of piety, but he has no life!' The Holy One, Blessed be He, said 'Adam, my servant at the time that I created this David his name was WeYithabba (And he shall be lost).' He said to the Lord of the World, 'How much life have I with you in this world?' The Holy One, Blessed be He, said, 'A thousand years.' Adam said to the Holy One, Blessed be He, 'Give me permission to give to this David a portion

of my years.' The Holy One, Blessed be He, sent down the angels of the Presence and called them as witnesses. 'Ye are my witnesses.' And He said to them, 'Give to Adam a hand, and witness concerning him and concerning the decree that he has decreed seventy years to David the son of Jesse.' And the Holy One, Blessed be He, brought a document and wrote a writing concerning Adam. When the Angel of Death went to him (Adam) and said to him, 'Give me the spirit of thy breath'; he said to him, 'From the mouth of the Holy One, Blessed be He, have I heard in my ears and He said to me: "A thousand years are thy years." But I have only lived nine hundred and thirty years." At that very hour the Holy One, Blessed be He, gave the writing to the Angel of Death, and He sent with him Gabriel and Michael and Saraphiel, They went down to Adam. Gabriel said to him, 'I remember the day when thou gavest seventy years to David the son of Jesse.' Michael and Saraphiel said to him: 'We testify against thee, and behold our names are in the writing.' He said to them, 'Then at that very hour, I shall die at the mouth of the three of you, as it is said: "At the mouth of two witnesses or three witnesses shall he that is worthy of death be put to death" ' (Deut. 17:6, 19:15).

Saraphiel, Gabriel and Michael and the Angel of Death are all here closely associated, and represented as God's four Archangels. It is interesting too that in this Midrash, Gabriel would seem to take precedence over Michael.

'Izrā'īl as the name of the Angel of Death is not found. In fact the Angel of Death is mentioned in the Qur'ān only in Sūra 32:11. In Sūra 79 (beginning) the phrases "By those who tear forth and those who draw forth" are understood by some as giving sanction to the idea that there are several angels of Death, as in Jewish literature. The name 'Izrā'īl is probably connected with 'Arsiel the prince of Hell. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum,* II p. 333 (Königsberg, 1711), cites *Emeq ha-Melekh,* fol 15, col 4:

"Arsiel (apparently wrongly cited as 'Asriel in art. Angel of Death, *Jewish Encyclopedia,* vol. IV. p. 482, and art. 'Izrā'īl in *Enc. Islam*), the prince of Hell stands before the breath of the righteous so that they should not pray for the wicked before the Holy One, Blessed be He, and that He should put them into his power to bring them down to the pit of destruction."

The Angel of Death like Isrāfīl the trumpet blower is of cosmic size.

"And as for the appearance of the Angel of Death, it is like the appearance of Isrāfīl in his face and tongues and wings and might and power, nothing more nor less" (Wolff, *ibid,* p. 15). He can lay one hand on the seventh earth and the other on the seventh heaven.

Wolff, *ibid,* p. 91.[4] The colossal size of the Angel of Death is mentioned too in Jewish Midrash, cf. "The Garden of Eden and Gehinnom" (Jellinek, *B.M.* V. 49), where we are told that the length of the Angel of Death is from one end of the world to the other. The Angel of Death in Arabic tradition has 70,000 feet and 4,000 wings, and his whole body is full of eyes[5] (cf. Wolff, *ibid,* pp. 20-21). This last feature is known to Jewish Haggada (*T. B. Abodah Zarah,* 20b), "They told him about the Angel of Death, how he is full of eyes." Ka'b al-Aḥbār (cf. Wolff, p. 23-25) is reported to have told how the Angel of Death is informed by God when to take a man's soul. There is a tree below God's Throne. Forty days before any man is due to die a leaf from the tree with the person's name on it falls into 'Izrā'īl's bosom. Another version is that an angel brings to the Angel of Death a writing from God containing the name of the man about to die, and the place where. In our MS. there seems to be direct communication between God and the Angel of Death. The tree under God's Throne is presumably the tree of life (*'ets Ḥayyim*). While *T. J. Ber.* 2:8:5c does not actually say that a leaf falls from such a tree as a method of signifying when a man shall die, the simile of the owner of a fig tree knowing when it is time to pluck the fruit, is closely linked there with how God knows when to bring up the righteous from the world.

As in Jewish Midrash so too according to Arabic legend the Angel of Death makes the removal of the soul of the righteous an easier and less painful process than that of the wicked (Midrash to Psalm xi).

The following is from Wolff's *Mohammedanische Eschatologie,* "Concerning the mention of the passing away of the Things."

Then Allah (Exalted is He) will command the Angel of Death to make the sea disappear, just as God said; "Everything shall pass away except His Countenance alone." And the Angel of Death will go to the sea and say: "Thy time of existence is finished." And he will say: "Grant me an opportunity of bewailing my death." So the Angel of Death will grant it, and the sea will say: "Where are my waves, and where are my wonders, and where are the ships which used to move upon me, and where are the living creatures?" But already the command of God had come, and therewith the Angel of Death will shout a mighty cry; then his water will be as though it had never been at all. Then he will go to the mountains and they will say: "Permit us to bewail our death." And they will say: "Where are our ascents, and where is our strength?" But already the command of Allah had come, and therewith the Angel of Death will shout with a mighty cry, and they (the mountains) will melt away. Then he will go to the earth, and it will say: "Grant me opportunity

to bewail myself." So it will say: "Where are my inhabitants and where are my trees, and my rivers and my different kinds of plants?" And the Angel of Death will shout with a mighty cry; then its walls will fall one by one, and its waters will disappear, and the sun and the moon will be darkened, and the stars will be scattered. Then Allah will say: "O Angel of Death, who remains of my creatures? (And He knows best)." And he (the Angel of Death) will say: "My God, Thou art the Living who dost not die; there remains Gibrīl, Mīkā'īl, 'Isrāfīl and the bearers of the Throne, and I the weak servant." And He will say: "Take their spirits." So he took their spirits. Then Allah will say: "O Angel of Death, hast thou not heard My Voice?" Every soul shall taste death. "And thou art one of my creatures. I created thee. So die." And he will die. (Leipzig MS. adds here as follows: Then Allah (Exalted is He) will command him to gather the spirit of his soul, and he will go to the place between Paradise and Hell, and he will look to heaven and take out his spirit and shout loudly: "Were all creatures alive, they had died at this shout." Then he will say, "Had I known that the spirit is taken out in this violent manner, I had in gathering the spirits of the Believers, taken pity." Then he will die and no one will remain.) And in another version (God said): "Go away and die between Paradise and Hell." So he will die there, and nothing will remain except Allah. And the world will remain thus for so long as Allah pleases.

Translation of the British Museum Arabic Eschatological Fragment

Copied from "The Book of the delights of Pleasant Companionship," by Al-Ḥarīrī (May Allah support him with His mercy):

It has been related on the authority of Yazīd al-Sahmī: he said, "I was sitting with a company among whom were 'Abdallah b. Salām, Ka'b al-Aḥbār and Sahl b. Ka'b b. Mūsā; and (we) betook ourselves to 'Uthmān at the time of his confinement. When we came to him and saluted him, we sat down and we found with him Salmān al-Fārisī. Then he drew a deep sigh and said, "How wearisome the world is to him that seeks it and is eager for it."

And Ka'b said, "You have reminded me, O Abū 'Abdallah, of a strange and dreadful tradition." Then he wept violently until his beard was moist with his tears, and we wept because he wept. Then he turned towards us and said, "If you only knew what I found in the book of Daniel the prophet (Peace be upon him). And we said, "Inform us of that, may Allah have mercy upon thee." And he said, "I looked at a scroll of it and I found in it, "Verily the world says morning and evening, *"O ye who are deceived by me,*[6] and are mad with love for me, cease from search for me and love of me; and covet

not that which will not remain to you, *for I am transient, but the afterlife, it is enduring*[7] and it is the reward; and for the good and evil which ye have done, I am witness regarding you *on the day when your mouths will have a seal put on them, and your members will be asked to speak*.[8] So exert yourselves in the search of the afterlife and know by what He will save you from me, for I am evanescent, transient."

Yazīd al-Sahmī said, "And I said, "O Abū Isḥāq, and does the world talk?" And he replied, "Celebrated be Allah's praise! *It hears*[9] too, and it sees, and it blesses, and it talks,[10] and it celebrates the praise of Allah in seventy thousand languages, none of which resembles another."

And I said, "Verily this is surely a strange wonder." And Ka'b replied, "And I shall increase (your wonder) with something more wonderful than this; verily it (the world) will taste death and shall be assembled along with those who will be assembled on the Day of the Resurrection; and it will give witness regarding every man and woman about the good and the evil which they have done." And I said, "This, by Allah, is more wonderful than the first." And Ka'b said, "By Him in whose hand my soul is, verily it shall surely taste death."

He said, "And he sobbed, then he said, "Listen and understand and consider, for in it there is a warning for you for the time is near for the destruction of the Spiritual Beings,[11] and the Cherubim,[12] and of all the angels of the heavens and the earth, and mankind and the Jinn, and the creeping things, and the wild beasts, and there shall only remain *a few of the angels who are nigh to him*,[13] like Gibrīl and Mīkā'īl and Isrāfīl and 'Izrā'īl (May Allah bless them all). Then Allah the Generous will say to the Angel of Death, "O 'Izrā'īl." And he will answer Him, "At Thy service, Lord." Then He will say: "Take the spirits of the Mountains, even as thou takest the spirits of the dead; and *crush them*[14] until they become a *level desert plain*.[15] And I have taken an oath upon myself that there shall not remain anything at all without my annihilating it and obliterating its traces."

He said, "So the Angel of Death will come to the Mountains, and shall summon them. "Peace be upon you, *O steadfast lofty Mountains*,[16] submit to the command of Allah (Great and Glorious is He!)" Then the Mountains will answer him and say, "And upon thee be peace, and the mercy and the blessings of Allah! Who art thou who greetest us and announcest to us our own death? For we have not heard speech since Adam (May Allah bless him and give him peace!) and the pure ones of his children died."

"Then he will say to them, 'I am the Angel of Death.' And when

the mountains hear him, they will clamour and be in commotion, and they will rise up and *go like boats in the sea.*[17] Then they will say to him, "O Angel of Death, hast thou been commanded anything regarding us?" And he will say, "Yes, I have been commanded to take your spirits, and to make your movements cease, for *the Hour has drawn*[18] nigh and the Resurrection has approached. Do ye not see the earth empty and the dwellings ruined? Or knew ye not that Allah hath imposed an oath upon Himself by Himself that *everything shall perish except His countenance?*"[19]

He said, "Thereupon the Mountains and the earth will shout and say, "Verily what is revealed concerning us is also revealed concerning thee." He said, "Then the Angel of Death will chide them severely; and lo! they will die away, no movement will be heard in them and no sound. They will have become *flattened ground*[20] and *a level desert plain.*[21] Then the Angel of Death will come and stand in his station, and Allah will say, " O 'Izrā'īl, what hast thou done with the mountains?" (But He knows better than he). And he shall say, "O Lord, Thou knowest best; I have left them crushed after the power of the might of high rank, weak in strength, abased, submissive to Thy command. So celebrated be Thy Praises! How great is Thy state, and how mighty Thy authority! And the Angel of Death is a servant that hears and obeys Thy command."

He said, "Then Allah will say, "O Angel of Death, these trees are growing, praising Me. They were a provision for the children of Adam; so go off to them and erase trace of them. For My oath has fallen upon everything so that it will be destroyed and pass away *until My Throne returns upon the water.*[22] He said, "So the Angel of Death will come to them and he will summon them, "Peace be upon you, O fruitbearing, green, flourishing trees, answer the summons, for the appointed time has drawn nigh." Then the trees will answer him quickly, and will return his salutation and will say, "Who art thou, who salutest us?" And there will not be upon the face of the earth any of the children of Adam. And he shall say to them, "I am the Angel of Death." And when the trees hear that, shuddering will fall upon them, and quaking will seize them, and they will become black till they become as though they were charcoal. And they will be in a commotion, and their boughs will tremble. Then will he say to the earth, "Seest thou not *the adornment* of thy face, and the verdure of thy trees? Thy face has been blotted out, and trace of thee has gone. *Now has the truth appeared*[23] and the command come down to thee, so take care." He said, "and the earth will answer and say, "Verily we were created for evanescence; where then is the place of refuge?"

He said, "And Allah will give the Angel of Death sufficient

strength whereby he will be enabled to take the spirits of all the trees in one hour. Then he will chide them severely; and lo! they will be broken, crushed, torn up from their roots, hurled upon the face of the ground one on top of another. They will have become crushed fragments. Then the Angel of Death will return until he stands in his station, and Allah will say to him, "O 'Izrā'īl, what is this thou has done?" (And He knows best!) Then he will say, "My God and my Lord, *Thou knowest the secret things, nothing is hid from thee*[24] in the earth or in the heavens. So may Thou be blessed, O Mighty One, O Most Powerful One! I have blotted out the trees, and I have destroyed the traces *as though they had not yesterday been existent.*"[25]

Then Allah (Great and Glorious is He!) will say, "O Angel of Death, go away to the *gushing springs*[26] and the flowing waters and the palatable springs and the raging seas, and quieten their movements and still their waves and stop their flowing: for I did not create anything in it to endure. So *the sentence has become due from Me*[27] —I will certainly annihilate everything which I have created, before the Day of the Resurrection, even though it was (created only) an hour before. For that is justice from Me towards My creation. And who escapes from Me in My kingdom, or who goes out from under My authority?"

He said: "Then the Angel of Death will come until he stands in the middle of the world; then he shall call, "O dashing *(? mutadaqqiqa)* seas and waters, copious, palatable, and raging, gather ye together for the execution of the command of your Lord." So all the seas will be gathered in one place; and in like fashion the springs and the rivers and the wādīs; then they will say to him, "Who art thou, fellow? Thy voice hath disquieted our hearts and crushed our strength, and we thought that thou wert *he that summons to the gathering.*"[28]

And he will say, "I am not he who summons to the gathering, but I am he who summons to destruction." Then when the waters hear him, they will become motionless and they will subside in their places, and their clearness will be changed. Then he will chide them once, and they will boil and bubble like pots when they boil; and he will chide them a second time, and lo! they will subside. Nothing will move in them, and no wave be stirred up in them. Then the Angel of Death will come and stand in his station."

Ka'b al-Aḥbār said, "And the world will remain *empty*,[29] and there shall not be upon its surface a mountain which is firm, nor a tree which bears fruit, nor a spring that flows. The Jinn and mankind and wild beasts and the rest of living things will have died, and the world will have become desolate, and *the she-camels ten months gone with young will have been neglected.*"[30]

Then Allah (Glorious is His Name!) will say, "O Angel of Death, go to the world, for it is *daniyya (contemptible)*[31] as I have called it, abased; and I will abase in it him who has sought it, and has been mad for it. It had from Me an appointed term, and days which are numbered. And it has passed away, its days are spent and its term has been cut off. So cause it to taste death just as it caused my creatures to taste (death)!" (?)

He said, "So the Angel of Death will go off to it,[32] and will stand in the middle of it and will say to it, "Peace be upon thee O wasted, worn-out one! Submit to death, for thy passing hath drawn nigh just as thy people and thine inhabitants passed away. What happened to those who inhabited thee? And what happened to thy waters and thy trees? And what happened to thy wild beasts and thy birds?"

He said: "And the world will answer him and say, "Hast thou not known, O thou that askest, that the command of my Lord came and He caused my inhabitants to die and effaced my rivers, and took away my trees? So who art thou that greetest us? For I have heard the word of the Prophets and the best of their people, and I have not shuddered at any save thee!" Then he will say to it, "I am he that is given power over creatures to take their souls; I am the Angel of Death, 'Izrā'īl." And when the world hears that, it will fall into a commotion, turning over and over from its east to its west, and from its west to its east; and its strata[33] and its torrentbeds will be in a commotion. And no impregnable portion nor any mighty barrier nor anything of what was upon its surface will remain, without becoming a level desert plain."

Then it will say, "By the power of my Lord! Had it not been for the graves which are in my belly,—and that Allah has commanded me not to bring them forth except when the Resurrection comes—I had turned myself *upside down,*[34] and *I had brought forth all that is in me*[35] in fragments (? *firaqan*) at what entered me from terror caused by thee and thy voice." Then it *will weep violently,*[36] and there shall flow from its tears, yellow bitter water; and the east and the west of the earth will be filled. Then it will crackle like the crackling of a fire, and it will call out: "O Angel of Death, my mountains have become decayed, and my springs, a disappearing trace. Then it will give *a great loud cry* (cf. Sūra 36:28) which, had the people of the world heard it, their souls had been shattered because of the greatness of its cry."

Yazīd al-Sahmī said, "And I said, "O Abū Isḥāq, and what will it say in its cry?" He said, *"It will say,*[37] "O Angel of Death, why do I not see *the birds*[38] which were upon my surface, praising my Lord upon the boughs of the trees by night and by day. And why do I

not see the wild beasts which were in the interiors of my wādīs and in the caverns of my mountains, praising their Creator in the mornings and the evenings? O Angel of Death, where hath the brightness of my day gone, and the light of my moon and my sun?"

And he will say to it, "Didst thou not know that thy fixed term is finished, and that thy period of time has passed away? And everything which was in thee hath gone; nothing hath remained of what Allah created, just as He foreknew that *He would begin the creation, then would bring it back.*"[39]

Then Allah will strengthen the Angel of Death permitting Gibrīl and Mīkā'īl and Isrāfīl to help him in the destruction of the world. So Gibrīl will stand on the right side on the east and Mīkā'īl will stand on the left side on the west, and Isrāfīl will seize upon the two sides of the world, and they will take hold of its flanks. And it will be in a commotion, and reel about and it will send forth a deep sigh, and will become strengthless. And 'Izrā'īl will stand in the middle of it, and will chide it; and lo! it will become extinct. Its speech will have been cut off and *its quakings*[40] will have become still."

Yazīd said, "And I said to Ka'b, "O Abū Isḥāq, what will the Angel of Death say to the world?" He said, "He will say, "O evanescent earth, thy movements shall surely be overthrown, and thy quakings be stilled by the power of Him who created thee and made evanescence *obligatory* upon thee."

Ka'b said, "By Him in whose hand my soul is, if the people of the world, yea, all of them, were alive, they would die at that hour. Then Allah will say to the Angel of Death, "Who remaineth?" (And He knoweth that best!) And he will say, "O Lord, Thy noble Countenance remaineth, and Gibrīl and Mīkā'īl and Isrāfil and thy weak servant 'Izrā'īl."[41] Then Allah will say, "O 'Izrā'īl go and gather the spirit of Gibrīl." So he will gather his spirit, and lo! he will be prostrate on his side (cheek)—dead with no spirit in him.

Then Allah will say, "Who remaineth?" (And He knoweth best!) Then he will say, "O Lord, thy glorious Face remaineth, and Mīkā'īl and Isrāfīl and thy weak servant 'Izrā'īl!" So Allah will command him to gather his spirit and lo! he will be prostrate upon his side—dead, with no life in him.

"Then He (glorious is His Name!) will say, "Who remaineth?" (And He knoweth best!) Then he will say, "Thy Noble Face remaineth, and Isrāfīl, and thy weak servant 'Izrā'īl." Then Allah will command him to gather the spirit of Isrāfīl. So he will gather his spirit, and lo! he will be prostrate upon his side, dead, with no spirit in him.

"Then Allah will say, "Who remaineth?" (And He knoweth

that best!) So he will say, Thy Noble Face remaineth, and thy weak servant 'Izrā'īl." Then Allah will say, *"Then let 'Izrā'īl die!"*[42] And lo! he will be prostrate upon his side—dead, with no spirit in him!

And heaven will remain empty of its inhabitants, and the lands empty of their people. In them no tongue will speak, nor eye twinkle. Then Allah will look on His creatures dead, with no spirits in them, and He (Glorious is His Majesty!) will call, *"To whom belongeth the Kingdom today?"*[43] And none will answer Him. And He will repeat it three times, and none will return Him a word. Then the Most Powerful One will reply to Himself. *"It belongeth to Allah, the One, the Subduer!"*[44]

And another version says that the last who will remain of the angels is Gibrīl. And the Truth (Glorious is His Majesty!) will say, "O Gibrīl, I have caused all my creation to die and that is by my decree, and my judgement thereon *in the preserved tablet,*[45] that only the *light of My Countenance*[46] and My Majesty, and My Greatness shall remain just as I was unique of old; I have not ceased. Then I shall bring *back*[47] the creation just as I originated them *the first time;*[48] and none other than thou hath remained of my creation. So I will take upon Myself the gathering of thy spirit, because thou art the wonder of my creation, and the *one I entrusted*[49] with *my revelation,* and my messages to all my prophets and my apostles. So die, Gibrīl, by My Will and by My Power."

He said, "So Gibrīl will fall down dead (lit. in a swoon), and will spread out four of his wings, and obstruct the East and the West."

Ka'b said, "And by Him who sent Muḥammad with prophecy, had the people of the Heavens and the earth heard Gibrīl falling dead, they had died from its awfulness and its intensity. And the Glorious One, (Glorious is His Greatness) shall remain: as He had been, He continues, *Single, Sole, Unique, Eternal!"*[50]

Yazīd said, "Then I said to Ka'b, "O Abū Isḥāq, who then is the first that Allah will quicken among His creatures, on the day of the Resurrection?" He said, "The first that Allah will quicken among His creatures is Isrāfīl. Then He will say to him, *"Blow on the Trumpet,*[51] the First Blast!" And Allah will change the earth for another earth, as He said (Exalted is He) "On the day when *the earth shall be changed*[52] for another earth." He will bring *a spotless earth*[53] *in which blood has not been shed,*[54] and on which God has not been disobeyed even for an instant. (lit. twinkling of an eye).

Yazīd said, "So we remained astonished at his tradition. Ka'b said, "It behooves you to be astonished at that, and it behooves you to fear. And it has reached me that Allah (Glorious is His Name) has an angel[55] in heaven, which had Allah commanded to send one

of his wings to the world, it had not contained it because of the immensity of its construction. And it has seventy thousand wings, all of them like that wing, and He shall surely mention death, and he shall fall down in a swoon from the fear of Allah and the terror of death, and he will not awake from his swooning until the day of Resurrection."

Yazīd said, "Thereupon I heard Salmān al-Fārisī saying, "By Allah, I shall not sleep upon a bed after this ever, and I shall not satisfy myself with sleep ever until I meet Allah." Then I came to 'Abdallah b. 'Abbās, and I related that to him; and he arose from his seat, entered his lodging, and I did not see him until after seven days. Then he came out after that, and I saw that he had become emaciated in his body, so I said: "Has illness befallen thee?" He said, "Illness and what an illness! to him who is intelligent and who reflects; and verily this information wounds the hearts and makes the eyes to weep." And Ibn 'Abbās since he heard this tradition, increased in illness every day.

Finished by praise of Allah and His Help.

JOHN BOWMAN

Department of Hebrew,
Leeds University,
Leeds, England

NOTES

[1] In the MS. the reading is not absolutely certain; it might be Ḥarīzī.

[2] Edited by M. Wolff, as his *Muhammedanische Eschatologie,* Leipzig, 1872.

[3] It is highly questionable whether it deserves the name of tradition as it has no *isnād*. The contents too belong rather to the realm of phantasy; yet tradition does not necessarily preclude phantasy.

[4] Wolff, p. 22 informs us that he has one foot on the bridge of Hell and the other on the Throne.

[5] When any soul in the world has died, an eye goes out in the body of the Angel of Death. Cf. Ezek. X, 12 where the Cherubim are described as "full of eyes," so also the wheels. In Ezek. I, 18 this is said only of the rims of the wheels. Cooke (I.C.C. *Ezekiel,* p. 116) has the following interesting note: "A remarkable illustration of this idea (i.e. Ezekiel's Cherubim being "full of eyes") is given by a small bronze figure of the Egyptian god Bes, found in the Serapeum at Memphis. The figure has four extended wings and four arms, and the body is covered all over with eyes. On each side of the head are four heads of animals. See Gressmann, *Texte und Bilder,* II, 162." The four beasts (cf. Ezekiel's Hayyoth) in Rev. IV, 6 around God's throne were "full of eyes before and behind."

[6] Cf. Sūra 45:34; 6:69; 6:130; 7:49; 31:33; 35:5.

[7] Cf. possibly Sūra 29:64; 6:32.

[8] Sūra 36:65; cf. also Sūra 41:18-21.

[9] The earth hears, cf. possibly Sūra 84:5.

[10] There is a legend that when the Angels were sent by God to take some clay from the earth that God might make man of it, the earth protested in speech to such effect that Gibrīl, then Mīkā'īl returned empty-handed. Finally God sent the

hard-hearted Angel of Death who would not listen to the earth's words of protest, cf. Mas'ūdī, *Les Prairies d'Or*. Ch. III.

[11] The *Rūḥānīyyūn* are a class of angels, so Wolff, p. 15, which owe their origin to the drops of light which fall from Gibrīl after he has bathed in the sea of light. But the term Rūḥānīyyūn is sometimes used as denoting Gibrīl, Mīkā'īl and Isrāfīl themselves.

[12] Cherubim are not mentioned in the Qur'ān. This term too usually signifies Gibrīl, Mīkā'īl, Isrāfīl and 'Izrā'īl; but cf. Wolff, p. 15, where the Cherubim are Mīkā'īl's angelic assistants, created from his tears.

[13] *al-Muqarrabīn*, Sura, 4:170; cf. also 3:40.

[14] crush them. cf. Sūra 69:14.

[15] a level desert plain, Sūra 20:106.

[16] steadfast lofty mountains, cf. Sūra 77:27. In Sūra 78:20 the mountains move on the Day of Resurrection. Were the mountains obliterated first so that the earth could be tackled more easily? cf. Sūras 16:15; 31:9; 21:32; 78:6, where it is stated that the mountains were placed on the earth to keep it from moving. However in Wolff's *Muhammedanische Eschatologie*, pp. 91-92, the dissolution of the mountains comes after that of the sea. In that tradition we have only mention of the destruction of the (a) sea, (b) the mountains, (c) the earth, before that of the archangels.

[17] cf. Sūra 52:10; 18:45. Like boats in the sea: this is an inversion of the simile in Sūra 42:31, "Of His signs are the ships that sail like mountains in the sea." The terms are however different.

[18] The hour has drawn nigh. cf. Sūra 54:1.

[19] Everything shall perish except His countenance, Sūra 28:88, cf. Sūra 55:26, 27, for parallel expression.

[20] cf. Sūra 69:14.

[21] Sūra 20:106.

[22] Until My Throne returns upon the water, i.e. until God's Throne is as it was before Creation. cf. Sūra 11:9.

[23] Now has the Truth appeared. Sūra 12:51.

[24] nothing is hid from Thee, cf. Sūra 3:4, 27; 14:40, 41; 87:7, etc.

[25] as though they had not yesterday been existent, Sūra 10:25.

[26] gushing springs cf. Sūra 36:34 cited as one of the mercies of God to man.

[27] the sentence has become due, cf. Sūra 37:30 (Where however the phrase is used in a different context).

[28] He that summons to the gathering, i.e. 'Isrāfīl cf. Sūra 50:40; 54:6. The gathering = the Gathering for the Resurrection, cf. Sūra 20:102; 50:43.

[29] empty: used of the earth in Sūra 84:4—one of the signs of the Resurrection.

[30] the she-camels etc. quoted from Sūra 81:4. In this Sūra also *wuḥūsh* used for wildbeasts, occurs only here in the Qur'ān. It would seem too that the account of the reaction of the mountains and seas has been drawn from this Sūra.

[31] contemptible *daniyya* pun on Dunyā, cf. Ghazālī's *al-Durra al-fākhira*, "The Precious Pearl," "O earthly world! O vile world! (*yā dunyā, yā daniyya* where are thy lords and thy rulers?).

[32] In Wolff's text the spirit of the "earth" is taken. Here instead of *arḍ*, it is *dunyā*.

[33] cf. Sūra 67:3; 71:14, where the same word is used for the seven "stories" (*ṭabaqātuhā*) of heaven.

[34] cf. the construction in Sūra 11:84.

[35] cf. 84:4; 99:2.

[36] Then it will weep violently: for the earth weeping cf. Sūra 44:28.

[37] It will say: cf. Sūra 99:3, "On that day (Resurrection) she shall tell her tidings."

[38] The birds: For the birds etc. praising God cf. Sūras 21:79; 34:10; 64:1.

[39] He would begin etc. Sūra 29:18; cf. also 27:65; 10:4; 30:10, 26; 83:13.

[40] its quakings: cf. Sūra 99:1, in which case the quaking of the earth is an accompaniment of the Resurrection.

[41] No mention is made of the bearers of the Throne as there is in Wolff's version.

[42] Then let 'Izrā'īl die, cf. 1 Cor. 15:26, "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

[43] To whom belongeth the Kingdom: Sūra 40:16; cf. also 22:55; 5:20 and 6:73. This quotation from Sūra 40:16 is not used in our MS. in quite the same sense as in Qur'ān, where "that day" refers to the Resurrection.

[44] It belongeth to Allah, etc. Sūra 40:16; cf. also 14:49.

[45] The preserved tablet: mentioned in Sūra 85:22. The heavenly prototype of the Qur'ān which remains besides Allah's Throne.

[46] Only the light of My Countenance shall remain: Sūra 55:26 and 28:88. One might say that Sūra 55:26 is the key verse to the whole tradition. It is further to be noticed that *fanā* which occurs so often in this MS., occurs in the Qur'ān only in Sūra 55:26. Sūra 24:35 or 39:69 may have inspired the idea of the "light" of God's countenance.

[47] Bring back: Sūra 10:4 etc.

[48] the first time *awwal marra.*

[49] the one I entrusted etc. *amīnī; Gibrīl* is called *ar-rūḥ al-amīn* in Sūra 26:193. Gibrīl is the bringer of the inspiration, cf. Sūras 42:51, 26:193, and 53:5.

[50] Single, Sole, Unique, Eternal, cf. Sūra 112:1, 2.

[51] Blow on the Trumpet, cf. Sūra 36:51, also 6:73, 18:99, 20:102, 23:103 and 50:19. In Sūras 27:89, 61:14, 78:18, coupled with the gathering of the peoples, is the destruction of the mountains, which according to this MS. have already been destroyed. In Sūra 39:68, it is at the second blast of the trumpet that the creatures shall arise.

[52] the earth shall be changed: Sūra 14:49. The recreation of the earth after its dissolution is found too in Jewish sources: Cf. Pirke R. Eliezer, i (the earth is folded up then unfolded). Scriptural basis for the belief in the prerequisite dissolution of the old heaven and earth would be supplied presumably by Isa. XXXIV, 4 (where the heavens are rolled up and their host—angel powers?—fall down), and Isa. LI, 6. This latter verse with its telling comparison of the eternal character of God's salvation and righteousness, and the transience of heaven and earth almost finds an echo in Sūras 28:88; 55:26,27, the *leitmotif* of our MS. Isa. LXV, 17 affords a basis for the new creation. The Midrashim Gen. R. XII, 6 and Ex. R. XV, 21 delight in describing the details of the things restored to their pristine perfection, without mentioning, however, the absolute cessation of the old world before this is accomplished. But Isa. LI, 6 is used (Esther R. Proem 11; Numb. R. XIII, 5; Lv. R. XI, 7) as argument against even the permanence of the light of the First Day of Creation, which light God has reserved for Messianic times (Ex. R. XV, 21).

[53] a spotless earth : cf. Apocalypse of St. John, 21:1.

[54] In which blood has not been shed etc. It would seem that Sūra 2:28 is at the back of the writer's mind, and that he is making a deliberate contrast to it.

[55] This may be the Angel of Death or Isrāfīl.

BOOK REVIEWS

Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur. Von Georg Graf. Zweiter Band; Die Schriftsteller bis zur mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts. Citta del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticano, 1947. pp. xxxi + 512.

For a correct understanding of the general character and scope of this second volume of Graf's encyclopedic work, we refer the reader to our review of the first volume (MUSLIM WORLD, Jan. 1947). Everyone knows that the Oriental churches had their own Bible, liturgy, hagiography, hymnody and other Christian books in Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, Latin or Greek. But the paradoxical fact remains that Arabic was also used by Christians in their worship long before the rise of Islam and that "the name of Jesus Christ was hallowed by the Arabs before they learned to revere that of Mohammed."

From the early days of Islam until the middle of the fifteenth century there was a constant stream of Christian Arabic literature by Orientals, Malekite (pp. 3-94), Maronite (pp. 95-101), Nestorian (pp. 102-219), Jacobite (pp. 220-292), and Coptic (pp. 294-467). The total volume of this may be called a river that made glad the city of our God. It was not always limpid but its very turbulence and occasional murkiness bear witness that it flowed from Sinai, Calvary and Olivet. It was no easy task for these priests and monks to tell the old, old story in Arabic speech and so to make it accessible to Muslims. The quantity, the variety, and the character of the books and manuscripts listed in this volume by Dr. Graf illuminates the statement of Petrus Venerabilis (died 1157): *"Sive ergo Mahometicus error haeretico nomine deturpetur; sive gentili aut pagano infametur; agendum contra eum est, scribendum est."*

The Oriental churches have often been accused of timidity in facing the aggressive and ever increasing strength of Islam. But the Oriental Christians all in some measure bore witness to their faith and many died as martyrs. The evidence of this abides in Arabic Christian literature. This should, therefore, not be characterized (or even by some caricatured) as "Mohammedan Controversy" but as a constant and often able confession for the Christian faith, sincere to the point of martyrdom. Dr. Graf lists several Biographies of those who died for the truth and Tributes written to their heroism.

The author follows the division by churches rather than by centuries, as already indicated. But an excellent, detailed table of contents and an alphabetical list of authors atones for this deficiency. Beginning with Theodore Abū Qūrra Dr. Graf lists the names of some thirty Malekite authors who wrote in Arabic for their contemporaries; seven Maronites, a rather insignificant group; more than sixty Nestorians, among whom was Abd-ul-Masiḥ al Kindi (pp. 135-146). This author's celebrated controversial Arabic treatise, of uncertain date (780-823), was translated into English by Sir William Muir (London, 1881); also later by missionaries into Turkish and Urdu. Dr. Graf gives a criticism of its contents, aim, date and probable authorship. He points out the strength of dialectic in these two controversial yet friendly epistles by a Muslim and a Christian.

"The weaknesses of Islam, historically and ethically, are laid bare in this work by the Christian author with greater boldness and broadness than in any other Christian Arabic polemic literature" (p. 136). The Bāhîra-Sergius legend of a monk by that name, who welcomed Muhammad, is traced to its sources more critically than heretofore (cf. Encyc. of Islam, *Bāhîra*).

Under Jacobite writers, some forty names are listed. Yaḥ-ya ibn 'Adi wrote extensively on dogma. His books on the Trinity are in reply to a Muslim vizier at the Court of Al Muqtadir (908-932). He also wrote on the Incarnation and on some difficult passages in the Gospels. Forty-nine of his works are listed with brief comment (pp. 239-249).

The Arabic writings by the Copts far outnumber those of the other Oriental Christians as does the number of authors (pp. 294-467). This was due to their Arab rulers and to the fact that while the Coptic language was less and less used their golden age of literary activity corresponded to that of the Arabs in the thirteenth century. Coptic Christian literature in Arabic covered the whole field of theology, church history, hagiography, commentaries etc. Outstanding apologists, however, are not among the list of writers, with two exceptions which we note. Al-Wadîh ibn Rāgā was born a Muslim, baptized Paul and joined a monastery to escape persecution. He wrote three apologetic works as well as a spiritual biography; the latter, however, is lost. Ar-Rashîd Abu-al-Khair was another who wrote (1245 A.D.) a book with the arresting title, "Antidote for the Minds (enmeshed) in (Muslim) Theology" (*Tiryāq-al-'uqūl fī 'ilm al-'usūl*). This MS. has twenty-four chapters and became good source material for later apologists.

We have no space for comment on the many devotional books, the psalmodies and hagiography in Arabic during a period of more than eight hundred years and which are here catalogued. It was a herculean labor of love, especially since the author was suffering illness.

There is a Supplement of Corrigenda to Vol. I (pp. 488-512) which indicates superb diligence and scholarship. Two Arabic fragmentary *MSS.* are noted as traced to the library of the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, New Jersey.

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER

New York City

Introduction to Iran. By Elgin Groseclose. New York, Oxford University Press, 1947. pp. 257. $3.50.

This book is of special interest to students of Islam and the Muslim countries because of the very frank way in which the author writes of the religion of Islam as he has seen it in Iran, and his detailed account of Christian missionary effort.

Special attention is also given to the economic, social and political forces in Iran. Dr. Groseclose is equipped in an extraordinary way to give facts and views on these phases of life. He has recently been Treasurer-General of Iran, and is an economist and the author of an authoritative book in this field, *Money: The Human Conflict.* More than twenty years ago the author first visited Iran as a teacher

in the American School at Tabriz. He worked also with the Near East Relief in Iran and the Russian Caucasus.

The facts and figures, moreover, are set forth in attractive style for Dr. Groseclose is an author of great ability. His novel *Ararat* several years ago was awarded a prize by the book-sellers themselves and his several other books have had a good reception by the public. The author has a sincere and vital interest in the people of Iran and he speaks with clarity and frankness about their means of livelihood, their morals and their wonderful cultural tradition.

Following an introduction to this ancient land and its people there are interesting sections on the social and political life and the economic background, as well as the morals and religion of the people. The reign of Reza Shah Pahlavi, who came into power in 1922 and died in exile during world war II, is treated in detail because modern Iran revolves so largely about this great character who rose from stable boy to king and founded the present dynasty.

A number of the outstanding economic and political questions of most recent times are treated in detail and the book closes with a most outspoken account of Russian relations with Iran. Some may have heard intimations of what the author describes authoritatively, since he acted as treasurer of the country for a part of this period.

To our mind this is the best book on Iran which has appeared in recent years.

J. Christy Wilson

Princeton, N. J.

Social Relations in the Middle East. By Stuart Carter Dodd, Ph.D., and Assistants. Beirut, Lebanon, American Press, 1946. pp. 803.

This is the third English edition, revised and enlarged, of a useful textbook in citizenship prepared for the Freshmen at the American University of Beirut by Stuart Carter Dodd, professor of sociology, and assistants in the course.

The author, who is now a member of the faculty of the University of Washington, Seattle, retains in this third edition the threefold central thesis on which was based the preceding issue, namely, that "social relations are changing; they are imperfect; and therefore, they must be studied towards controlling them."

The text proper is divided into four parts, the first of which discusses the sectors of society based on the author's heavy work, *The Dimensions of Society* (Macmillan, N. Y., 1942), and one of those sectors—the people.

By far the longest section is part two which consists of some twenty-six chapters descriptive of the inter-relations of people including their institutions. The third part deals with the spatial relations of people and part four, perhaps the most significant, is devoted to temporal relations and treats of social change in the light of the chain of relationships linking the past with the present and the future. A brief closing chapter takes up the topic of social planning in a most thought-provoking manner.

Also included in the book is an excellent "teaching manual" of more than two hundred and fifty pages containing many interesting

suggestions which are likely to be appreciated not only by teachers of Lebanon but also those of many another country.

It is to be regretted that the author incorporates into this most worthwhile introductory text his daring and somewhat one-sided attempt at an analysis of society "into four sectors, namely, space, time, people, and their interrelating characteristics." And when he goes on to write that "the four sectors of society enable us to make a *scientific* study of society, instead of a literary or a philosophical study" he seems to be going out of his way to invite criticism.

However, this shortcoming is not serious enough to prevent readers, be they students, teachers or just "plain folks," from learning much from this book. Among other things, Dr. Dodd and his assistants succeed in making vividly clear that Lebanon is an area of great diversity and at the same time much unity, that its problems, processes, and institutions, though different in detail, are essentially the same as those of other areas of the world.

CHARLES G. CHAKERIAN

Hartford Seminary Foundation

Islam in the World. By Zaki Ali, M.D. Lahore, Pakistan, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf. (First edition, 1938, reviewed in THE MOSLEM WORLD, October, 1938). Second edition, 1947, pp. x, 434, maps. RS. 8.

Dr. Zaki Ali has tried something too vast for one man or one volume. He has come remarkably close to succeeding. He has discussed the social, cultural, and religious heritage of Islam in one section of the book, and then has shifted to a consideration of the Muslim nations, their history, problems, and aspirations, and especially their present viewpoint on questions of international interest.

The book is not scholarly. It is a nuisance that there is no index, and not much organization of the material. It would be good for a reader to check names, dates, figures, and even basic facts with other sources. One might, for instance, get the impression on page 189 that Turkey both did and didn't enter the Second World War—

"In August, 1944, Turkey severed diplomatic relations with Germany, and on February 23, 1945, declared war on Germany and Japan."

"In the Second World War, Turkey remained neutral, and from a purely nationalist point of view, her neutrality was a success."

And on the next page we hear of the Turkish government's "statistic methods" when the subject probably under consideration is "etatism" or "statism," the system of government monopoly in certain industries. Perhaps we ought to apologize to the author for the elusiveness of the English language.

Encyclopedic purpose in a compass of 434 pages entails considerable omission, and we could wish for more evidence and more ample interpretation all through, if we were reading for more than a general impression of the author's point of view.

The book is twice useful, however. First, it is a concise exposition of the way the world looks to a well-read thoughtful Indian Muslim, his apologetic for his religion addressed to readers in the "Christian" nations, and his suggestions for the solution of many vexing problems. And second, it might well serve as a guide-book to

the sore-spots in the Muslim world. The issues that he finds important are certainly real, and the geographical areas of conflict that he discusses deserve our attention and our closer investigation, with the help of other sources. It is unlikely that we would always come out with his answers, but his questions, at least, are stimulating and valid.

C. Robert Avery, Jr.

Hartford

Ghazali als Apologeet van de Islam. By A. Th. van Leeuwen. Leiden, 1947, pp. 216.

This book on Ghazālī as an apologist of Islam is a Leiden thesis, sponsored by Prof. Kraemer. It does not pretend to bring to light any new material about Ghazālī, but, as the sub-title indicates, it intends to be a contribution to the interpretation of his person and work. Dr. van Leeuwen is convinced that the Western interpretation of Ghazālī of the last hundred years is strongly prejudiced. He does not object to these prejudices in themselves, because to his mind this phenomenon accompanies necessarily the study of Islam and of religions in general, but he enters a protest against the use of modern criteria in judging this mediaeval philosopher. Particularly he rejects Frick's analysis of Ghazālī's autobiography, which uses the criterion of modern personality and for this reason prefers Augustine to Ghazālī; and he objects to Obermann's typifying Ghazālī as subjectivist pre-eminently, both in philosophy and in theology. Over against them Dr. van Leeuwen wants to understand Ghazālī within the framework of the Islam of his time, and he thinks he can typify the whole of his life and work as that of an apologist of Islam.

In the first main division the author analyses the *Munqidh min al-ḍalâl*. He points out a few striking discrepancies in this autobiography. Whilst Ghazālī first gives the impression of having been obsessed by the search for truth and evidential certainty, later on he restricts his estimate of the validity of the autonomy of science on the ground that the masses would be in danger of getting confused by it. Whilst Ghazālī condemns severely scholastic theology because it tries to prove the unprovable, he uses its weapons without scruple in the refutation of the Ta'līmiyya-sect. And this is a third enigma, when the *Munqidh* gives at first sight the impression that Ghazālī's flight from Baghdad and his controversion to Sufism meant the great turning-point in his life. But in that case why does he not attack *kalām,* philosophy and the Ta'līmiyya-sect with the arguments of mysticism? Why does he not picture his life before his conversion in dark colours, as Augustine did in his *Confessions?* The solution of these problems is sought by Dr. van Leeuwen in Ghazālī's being and remaining above all an apologist of Islam. That is why he did not draw the inferences from his search for evidential truth, why he did not carry through his criticism on the theology of his days to the end, why he did not set mysticism squarely against dogma and law.

In the second main division the author takes his stand against Obermann's *Der philosophische und religioese Subjektivismus Ghazālīs* with the help of an analysis of the *Tahâfut al-falâsifa* and the *Iḥyâ 'ulūm al-dīn,* particularly of the second book, the *Qawā'id*

al-'aqā' id. Dr. van Leeuwen does not approve the drawing of a comparison between Ghazālī's demolition of philosophy and the work of Hume and Kant, centuries later. The *Tahāfut* is entirely based on Islamic dogma, and the second book of the *Iḥyā* was meant as the positive counterpart of the negative *Tahāfut.* Here we are faced with a new problem, as the *Qawā 'id al-'aqā' id* is a piece of genuine *kalām* and as such a *corpus alienum* in the *Iḥyā.* The *Iḥyā* in general has been built up as an anthropology with man in the center, but the second book is theological in outlook. There is a striking difference in the way he deals with the problems of free will, theodicy, *fiṭra,* point of view—and in the remainder of the *Iḥyā.*

Finally the author gives special attention to the 28th book of the *Iḥyā* and to the *Mishkāt al-anwār.*

Dr. van Leeuwen has given indeed an important contribution to a better understanding of the great reformer of Islam, and it is the more regrettable that only those who know Dutch have access to his work. He attempted to judge Ghazālī, not with modern prejudices, but against his own background and within the framework of Islam. However, he did not quite succeed in carrying through his conception of Ghazālī as one of the deepest apologists of Islam that ever lived—as Dr. Kraemer put it in his *Christian Message in a non-Christian World.* In the second division of his book, and in the summary at the end, he has dropped this conception. As a matter of fact, if one considers Ghazālī mainly as an apologist (against whom?), it is impossible to allow for his acceptance of the full-fledged mysticism that is clearly manifest in the *Mishkāt al-anwār.* One seems to be closer to the truth by not trying to reduce Ghazālī's life and work to one formula but by tracing different conflicting motives, as for instance his craving for scientific certainty, his desire for a personal link with God and his anxiety to prevent the break-down of the authority of Islam as a theocratic-legalistic system.

Also in some less important points, the reviewer cannot agree with the author. One cannot call Islam without comment a rationalistic religion nor contend that the conflict between revelation and reason is inevitable. Here comes out Dr. van Leeuwen's own prejudice. His division of modern Ghazālī-interpretations into Roman-Catholic, cultural-historical and modernistic ones is not very clear cut. A clear mistake is to be found on page 100, where according to the author al-Ash'arī (d.324 A. H.) criticises an opinion of al-Bāqillānī (d.403 A. H.). In general the author gives little attention to Ghazālī's predecessors. One may doubt whether Ghazālī defended the necessity of prophethood with totally new means, as the author contends on page 93. Al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā had shown the way here.

This does not alter the fact that Dr. van Leeuwen has given a work of outstanding qualities, and of importance both for the history of religions and for the Christian approach to Islam. This approach will have to shift more and more from the periphery of Islam to its center and this work makes an important contribution to that purpose.

D. C. Mulder

Henry Martyn School, Aligarh, U. P., India

Studies in Islam and Christianity. By Muhammad Sadiq Dudley Wright, Phil.D., F.Z.S. Lahore and Woking, The Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, n.d. pp. 184.

This book consists of six chapters, in five of which Christianity is adversely criticized. The other upholds the view frequently advanced that Judas acted out of a desire to make Jesus hasten the coming of the Kingdom. The writer shows wide scholarship and a highly developed critical faculty when dealing with Jesus and Christianity; but when he deals with Islam his scholarship is not so apparent, and his critical faculty seems to be in abeyance. There are matters in this book with which one can agree, such as the statement that Christ is not a name but a title (though Messiah does not mean "the sent one" as the author says), and the discussion of the motives of Judas. With the main arguments and method, however, one cannot so readily agree. The book is published under Ahmadiya auspices, and like Ghulam Ahmad, the founder of that movement, who claimed to have come in the spirit and power of Jesus yet showed a strange antipathy to him, the author finds serious faults in Jesus, a characteristic contrary to the spirit of the Qur'ān. But he makes the common error of first suggesting that the Gospels are unreliable sources and then using their material to discredit Jesus. If the sources are so unreliable, a critic should be content to say so, adducing his proof, and refrain from using them for any purpose. The author seems to have some doubt regarding the miracles of Jesus, but does the Qur'ān not quote them as evidences of his mission? Dr. Wright argues against Christian doctrine in quite a legitimate manner, but when he compares Christianity and Islam, he tends to emphasize the defects of Christians and speak as if Muslims had always lived on a higher plane. This is not fair argument. Both Muslims and Christians have their defects.

The author is evidently unaware of Dr. Bell's translation of the Qur'ān, saying Pickthall's is "the last English translation." He too readily accepts the conventional story of the compilation of the Qur'ān without considering what research has shown on the subject. And when he inveighs against Muslims who foisted miraculous stories on Muhammad and says "the effort was not permitted to succeed," does he realize that he must include Bukhari in their number, and does he mean that Bukhari has been censored?

JAMES ROBSON

Glasgow

The Mufti of Jerusalem: The Story of Haj Amin el Husseini. By Maurice Pearlman. London, Victor Gollancz, Ltd., 2nd Edition, 1947, pp. 91, with four illustrations. 6 sh.

The subject of this biography, great champion of Arab interests in the Near East and the most distinguished antagonist of Jewry, is a man of mystery. By origin a member of a distinguished family in Yemen, the Aswads, which was later united by marriage to the Husseini family in Palestine, the Mufti of Jerusalem bears the dignity and prestige of a Sayyid as descendant of the Prophet and Hajji because of his Meccan pilgrimage.

Born in 1893, he went to Cairo and was the pupil of Rashid

Rida at al-Azhar. He returned to Jerusalem and although deeply implicated in the riots and massacre of the Jews, April 4, 1920, he was elected Mufti in 1921.

This book tells of his career from that date to the present. The author might have chosen as title for the book that of Chapter V, "I accuse." It is a well documented indictment of the Mufti's growth in power and influence in the Near East and later as sinister agent of Germany in the World War. He gave broad-casts from Berlin and Rome, incited revolts against Great Britain and France among the Arabs and Persians, but more especially worked against the Jews as the common enemy. Our author quotes from many documents to substantiate the story of intrigue, of clever escapes and being finally refugee-guest of the King of Egypt at Cairo; in spite of all efforts to hold him as suspect war-criminal in Paris. It is an astonishing story. One would like further corroboration, however, of the statement on page 66. "It has now been established that five million seven hundred thousand Jews in Europe were exterminated in Nazi concentration camps. It has now also been established that the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el Husseini, played an active role in that unprecedented massacre of a people. Records found in Nazi archives and evidence produced at the Nuremberg trials reveal in specific terms that the ex-Mufti was a leading henchman of the SS.Obersturmbannfuehrer Eichmann, principal executive officer in the liquidation of European Jewry. It is now established that, but for Haj Amin, the scale of murder might not have been so extensive and hundreds of thousands of Jewish lives might have been saved."

The evidence at "Questions Time in the House of Commons" (Chapter XII) gives one furiously to think. And the Mufti is still at large.

S. M. Zwemer

New York City

A Handbook of Muhammadan Art. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. By M. S. Dimand. New York, Hartsdale House, 1947, pp. x, 347; figs. 213, map. $5.00.

Dr. Dimand's popular Handbook was originally published in 1930. The main purpose of the book was to serve as a concise manual for students and collectors and as a guide for the visitors of the Metropolitan Museum's collection of Islamic art. That it served this end well was evidenced by the fact that a second and enlarged edition appeared in 1944.

The second edition was thoroughly revised and certain sections of it were completely rewritten. The chapter on ornaments was replaced by the one on the origins of Islamic art, additional material of exceptional value was incorporated on the Metropolitan Museum's excavations in Ctesiphon and Nishapur, the number of illustrations was increased from 173 to 213, and the bibliography and chronological tables were brought up to date. The present volume is a reprint of the second edition from which the four plates in color have been left out. This omission, however, has been compensated by the inclusion of a decorative design on the cover and by the addition of a useful map on the end papers.

The amount of study and exact scientific research necessary for a work of this nature is very seldom fully realized. The author must not only be thoroughly familiar with the objects in his own collection but must have also studied and compared practically all other similar objects in other well-known collections and gathered every proof available so as to be sure of his datings and attributions. This edition of the Handbook is based on the best information available and supplies us with carefully written descriptions of material, but a few corrections are necessary. The leaf from a Qur'ān reproduced in figure 38, on page 69, is written in the *Thulth* or *Thuluth* and not in the *Naskhī* script. The leaf from a MS. reproduced in figure 44, on page 77, is not from the *Gulistān* of Sa'dī but from the *Dīvān* of Ḥāfiẓ.

The system of transliteration is somewhat inconsistent and causes confusion. The consonant *'ain* for instance is sometimes indicated and sometimes omitted. The *hamza* is invariably left out, and so is the Arabic article *al* which precedes names of persons, places or things. Other diacritical marks have been altogether dispensed with. It is of course understandable that in a popular work of this nature the author is justified in leaving out these marks the insertion of which not only confuses the lay reader, but also takes too much time and increases the printer's cost. For the sake of consistency and uniformity it would have been advisable to have omitted all such marks.

There are a number of typographical and orthographical errors which may be pointed out. On p. 2, read "founded" for "found"; pp. 5, 149, read "Qalāwūn" for "Kalaun"; p. 30, read "Rabī'-i-Rashīdī" for "Rab-i-Rashidi"; p. 33, read "Qavām" for "Kauram"; p. 44, read "kolāh" for "kula"; pp. 51, 76, read "muẓahhib" for "muzahib"; pp. 54, 63, read "Āqā" or "Āghā" for "Aka"; p. 71, read "shawwāl" for "shawal"; pp. 101, 114, read "Rukiyya" for "Rukayya"; pp. 43, 204, 205, read "Qāsim" for "Kasim."

These criticisms, however, do not in any way impair the value and the usefulness of Dr. Dimand's book. The second edition of the Handbook contains a wealth of information which has been very carefully assembled. It is not crowded with any unnecessary and confusing material, and can be recommended not only to those who wish to study the Metropolitan Museum's Near Eastern collection, but to all who desire to reinforce their knowledge of Islamic art.

MEHMED A. SIMSAR

New York City

CURRENT TOPICS

Another Hospital in Arabia

A circular letter dated November 30, 1947, from Qatar, on a peninsula of the Persian Gulf between Bahrain and "the Pirate Coast," comes from Dr. and Mrs. W. Harold Storm, from which the following item is quoted by permission:

"Another milestone has been added to the history of the Arabian Mission when we came over to Qatar and on November 22nd took over from Shaikh Hamid a lovely little hospital he had built for us right down on the sea. It has room for twenty patients, has an operating unit, and good space for a clinic. The whole is built around a courtyard. We are tremendously pleased. Now the Shaikh is going to build a second story which for the present we will use as quarters for the doctor and staff and servants. Six years ago a frightful smallpox epidemic raged in Qatar. We vaccinated 1200 members of the ruling family, then asked for permission to go to the villages that were being decimated by the disease. The Shaikh replied, 'You have vaccinated the royal family; it is enough.' God still works miracles; we praise Him and go forward."

A Muslim Prayer

A leaflet called "ISLAM, Its Glory and Culture," is published by the Young Men's Muslim Association of Durban, Natal, South Africa. The issue for January 30, 1948 (Vol. 3, No. 4) presents a statement and prayer which are reprinted in part without comment and with one change in spelling.

"Today Muslims every where in the world are passing through a most difficult crisis. They are being persecuted mercilessly and are having to undergo great hardships. In such times Muslims all over the world should offer special prayers for their brethren, and one form of the special prayer is to read Qunuta Nazala in all their daily Farze prayers. The Qunuta should be read in the last rakaat of every Farze Prayers, after rising from the ruku and before going into Sajada. We are pleased to note that this is already being done in many Mosques, and it is our earnest appeal to the responsible officials of Mosques where this is not being done to start immediately with this most auspicious dua. This dua was taught to us by the Holy Prophet (P.B.O.H.) himself, he used to read it whenever the Muslims faced a crisis during his time. What could be a better and more suitable dua, than the one shown to us by the Prophet himself? No other dua can be more quickly accepted by the Almighty Allah than the one which He used to accept from the Prophet himself.

"The following is the transliteration of the dua, followed by its translation:—

[The transliteration is the part which is omitted. Ed.]

"O Allah! guide us among those whom Thou has guided aright and preserve us among those whom Thou hast preserved and be-

friend us among those whom Thou hast befriended and bless us in what Thou dost grant us and protect us from the evil of what Thou hast judged, for surely Thou judgest and none can judge Thee, surely whom Thou befriendest is not disgraced and whom Thou art displeased with none can exalt. Blessed art Thou our Lord and Exalted. We ask Thy protection and turn to Thee for mercy. O Allah! send Thy choicest Blessing on Thy venerable Prophet. O Allah! forgive the sins of the believing men and women and the Muslim men and women and unite their heart amongst them and straighten out their affairs and grant them supremacy and victory over those who are Your and their enemies. O Allah! unleash your wrath on those unbelievers who prevent people from following Your right path and who invent lies against Your Prophets and who fight bloody fights with your friends. O Allah! break up their unity and totter and tremble their steps when they go out to oppose the Muslim, and send down your punishment on them which indeed you do not withhold from the evil doers."

Love in Human Relationships

One of our Corresponding Editors, Dr. E. H. Douglas, supplies the following item of interest:

Monsieur A. Demeerseman, Director of the Institut des Belles Lettres Arabes at Tunis and editor of its quarterly, IBLA, addressed a group of medical men, in April 1946, on the theme, "The Tunisian Milieu and Its Problems," (Published, Tunis, 1946). On this occasion the eminent scholar developed the idea of the necessity for mutual comprehension and a broad spirit of love as a basis for the wholesome relationship between the two civilizations confronting each other in the French Protectorate of Tunisia. His penetrating and warmly sympathetic analysis of the problem is brought to a close by these words:

"The law of justice and love is the only substantial tie which can unite . . . our irreducible diversities. There lies our well-being and our mutual complement. There lies our true relationship. . . .

"It is only by remaining resolutely, on both sides, in the line of justice and charity, on the plane of the person as well as on that of the community, that we shall be able to secure social equilibrium, assured by the divine plan: 'Do not to others what you would not that they do to you.' Thus an order of justice will be assured. 'Do unto others as you would that they do unto you.' Thus an order of charity will be assured."

From the missionary point of view, in a world of apparently increasing conflicts, at an epoch when verbal proclamation of Christian truth leaves the Muslim hearer unaffected, the very minimum that can be expected of us, and perhaps the ultimate that we can ever hope to achieve, may well be the very expression of Christian love in human relationships.

Out of a world of social turmoil and strife another son of France, Victor Hugo, once courageously wrote:

"Love always, and love again.
When love departs, hope flees.
Love! It is the voice of dawn;
Love! It is the hymn of night!"

Jesus, Gandhi and the Egyptian Press

An interesting series of articles on Gandhi, comparing him with Christ, has appeared in the Egyptian press. Translations prepared by the Press Translation Service, then headed by the late C. C. Adams, have been sent to THE MUSLIM WORLD. The first appeared in *Akhbar al-Yom* on January 31, 1948.

"GANDHI

By Tewfik el Hakim

Gandhi lived in the same spirit as did Jesus, and he died assassinated by his own people as was Jesus killed by his own. He met the tyranny of the British Empire with a goat, as Jesus faced the tyrannic legions of the Roman Empire with an olive branch. His gospel was: "Do not resist strength with strength but resist agression with non-violent and peaceful measures." He hated violence, yet he was killed in violence. In this way too he resembled Jesus.

Gandhi is the miracle of the twentieth century. In this scientific and materialistic age no one expected a man who would disown all the advantages of materialism and weapons of violence to meet, instead, every situation with spiritual power, and so, once again, teach the world the same lessons that Jesus taught.

Gandhi, the miracle of the East, proved again to the world that the East alone is the source of spiritual enlightenment, even twenty centuries after Christ. It is only the East which is capable of producing a man who could follow more truly than any in the footsteps of the Son of Man.

Gandhi is dead, but in body only. During his life he sacrificed his body by denying it all physical comfort, thus "burning it" so as to add fuel to the fire of his spirit, so that it might become a torch to lighten the path of a nation, a world and an age.

At the end bullets pierced his body as did nails the body of Jesus. But the soul is immortal and his spirit is still with us to shed its rays of peace upon the earth for another twenty centuries.

Yes, Gandhi is still living to teach the whole world how a pure soul can help man to rise above earth's armies, crowns and empires and identify itself with the Kingdom of Heaven. He reminds the Western world, drowning in the turmoil of world-wide aggression and atomic bombs, of the thing which Jesus said, "For what doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his soul."

O Western World, kneel for a moment with the East, covering your face with shame, and behold a man, his body now in ashes, who walked the earth delivering this message while the world's temples and cathedrals remained silent. O Western World, when will you learn this eternal lesson!"

In reply to Tewfik el-Hakim's article about Jesus and Gandhi, quoted above, another article, written by an Azhar Shaikh, Muhyi al-Din Rida, called in question the death of Jesus used in the comparison. It appeared in *Majallat al-Sabah,* on February 1, 1948, as follows:

"JESUS, GANDHI AND TEWFIK EL HAKIM

Tewfik el Hakim wrote in the *Akhbar al-Yom Weekly* comparing Mohatma Gandhi to Jesus Christ, and in his comparison he made

the mistake of declaring something which is contrary to the Holy Book (Koran). Tewfik el Hakim wrote:

(1) 'Gandhi . . . died, assassinated by his own people as was Jesus killed by his own.'
(2) 'At the end bullets pierced his body as did nails the body of Jesus.'

The astonishing thing about Tewfik el Hakim is that while he claims, in his book about Muhammad, that he wrote his book after a great deal of investigation and verification, yet these quotations are directly opposed to the word of God Almighty as found in the chapter called "Women" in the Koran, which says:

'. . . and for their saying, "Verily we have slain the Messiah, Jesus the son of Mary, an Apostle of God." Yet they slew him not, and they crucified him not, but they had only his likeness, and they who differed about him were in doubt concerning him: no sure knowledge had they about him but followed only an opinion, and they did not really slay him.' (Koran, 4:157, Rodwell's translation, p. 427).

This is a direct quotation and it is evident that Christ's death and crucifixion never took place. This fact was revealed by the Spirit of Truth to the True Prophet."

In reply to the above article, the following article was written by Tewfik el Hakim and published in *Akhbar al-Yom* on February 7, 1948:

"Let Religion Elevate Your Life

Omar Ibn al Khattab (the first Khalifa after the Prophet Muhammad) was very strict and rigid in observing the laws of God. He was zealous in inculcating honesty among men. While he was walking in the market, one day, he saw a man pick up a walnut and run down the street shouting, "Who has lost a walnut, who has lost a walnut." Omar was displeased and commandingly said to the man, "Eat it, you man of false piety."

There are some people who would pick a word from a book, separate it from its context, divorce it from its motivation and brandish it before men crying, "Religion is being abandoned, religion is being abandoned." Such hypocritical people understand and appreciate religion in word only. Their limited horizon renders them unable to comprehend that mere words do not constitute a menace to religion in the same way that a walnut is not a menace to honesty.

In every age writers and poets have made use of the stories and incidents of the past without being attacked and questioned concerning their own beliefs. Who today would accuse a poet who writes something about the poetic muse, Mars or Neptune, of disbelief in the one true God. Poets today use these stories from ancient literature for their own ends without being afraid that there are people who are so narrow-minded that they cannot differentiate between a poet's writings and his real religious beliefs.

One of the readers (of my previous article) in his anxiety to protect religion threateningly brandished his indignant objection, simply because he read in the eulogy of a great man that this man lived in spirit as Jesus did and died assassinated by his own people as was

Jesus by his own, thus missing the real point of the comparison. He therefore, took great pains to remind us of the sacred text, "They neither killed him nor crucified him, but this was put into their imagination." This verse will always be kept in mind and not forgotten, but unfortunately there are simple-minded people who claim that they are the only ones who keep this verse in mind to teach and observe its truth.

The Muslim theological professors comment (teach) that the words "this was put into their imagination" mean that the one who was actually crucified and killed was someone who was miraculously put in Christ's place, while Christ was miraculously taken to heaven. In my eulogy it was my intention only to emphasize this fact of the maltreatment of a great man by his own people, and in so doing I used the example of Jesus who was also thus treated. The Christian reader is free to explain this event in accordance with what is written in the Bible—after all religion is a man's personal relationship with God.

However, I salute all those who are devoted to religion, and I urge everyone to be proud of his own religious beliefs, as I believe it was religion which has elevated man above all of God's other creations. Intelligence is not a monopoly of man alone, neither is discipline nor systems of political and economic order, because the animal kingdom has its own disciplinary system. The ants would seem to have a more perfect economic system than our own. The only thing which really differentiates man from the lower animals is his ability to have faith. No other community, except the human community has been able to discover and use this element of faith. The door leading to the possibility of a spiritual life was opened only to man.

O man, if you discard your spiritual life you will have discarded your true humanness. If you abandon true religion you have lost all your humanness and become instead an animal, looking for daily food on four legs, thus rendering yourself incapable of looking towards heaven. Religion has raised man to higher levels than the mere use of his feet, the earth, food and drink in seeking for existence. If you, O man, cannot raise your eyes higher than mere human existence, you are no better than the other animals. But, if you can look up to where God can be found, then you can be the true master of all Creation."

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

By Sue Molleson Foster
Union Theological Seminary Library

I. GENERAL

Études sur Qirqisani. Georges Vajda. (In *Revue des Études Juives,* Paris. N.S. vol. 7, 1946-1947. pp. 52-98).

Continued from N.S. vol. 6, 1941-1945, and dealing with religious legislation in this issue.

The Strange Case of Dr. Joseph Wolff, D. M. Dunlap. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal,* London. July-October, 1947. pp. 320–323).

Visiting Bukhara in 1831-'32 and again in 1843-'45, Wolff is one of the great names in Eastern travel.

The Possibility of the Universe in al-Farabi, Ibn Sina and Maimonides. Emil L. Fackenheim. (In *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research,* vol. XVI, 1947. pp. 39-70).

Maimonides' synthesis of *cretio ex nihilo* and philosophical necessity represents an advance over al-Farabi and Ibn Sina from the standpoint of theological exigencies.

II. ARABIA

The Arabian Peninsula: the Protectorates and Sheikhdoms. J. Y. Brinton. (In *Revue Égyptienne de Droit International,* Alexandria. Part 3, 1947. pp. 25-38).

A survey of the international position of the smaller states.

In Search of Arabia's Past. Peter Bruce Cornwall. In *The National Geographic Magazine,* Washington, D. C. April, 1948. pp. 493-522).

Tells of research in Bahrain and Hasa, now places of world importance because of their huge oil resources.

Saudi Arabia: Oil Kingdom. Maynard Owen Williams. In *The National Geographic Magazine,* Washington, D. C. April, 1948. pp. 497-512).

Fine illustrations to accompany Mr. Cornwall's article.

III. HISTORY OF ISLAM

An Appreciation of Shāh Walīyullāh al-Muhaddith ad-Dihlawī. (In *Islamic Culture,* Hyderabad. October, 1947. pp. 340-352).

The biography of the Indian Muslim scholar and reformer (1702-1763), the first Indian translator of the Qur'an into Persian.

Aspects of Early Moslem History. A. L. Tibawi. (In the *Journal of the Middle East Society,* Jerusalem. Autumn, 1947. pp. 23-34).

A brief discussion and suggested conclusions on first century Islamic history.

NATURE OF THE ISLAMIC STATE. Dr. Majid Khadduri. (In *Islamic Culture,* Hyderabad. October, 1947. pp. 327-331).
The state is not a theocracy but a nomocracy, governed by the sharī'ah.

PERSIAN CULTURAL RELATIONS WITH THE WEST. Issa Sadiq. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. October, 1947. pp. 359-365).
Gives an account of Iran's contributions to the science, art, literature and commerce of the West.

LA VIE INTERNATIONALE DES ÉTATS ARABES DE LEUR FORMATION A NOS JOURS. Joseph Chlala. (In *Revue Égyptienne de Droit International,* Alexandria. Part 3, 1947. pp. 39-113).
A chronology of important events and treaties, with source references.

IV. QUR'AN. TRADITION. THEOLOGY

THE PERSIAN SAGE. C. S. C. Williams. (In *The Church Quarterly Review,* London. January-March, 1948. pp. 177-191).
Concludes the study of the teaching of Aphraat, who lived in the Fourth Century A.D.

V. RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL LIFE

FOOD PRODUCTION IN IRAQ AND PERSIA. (In *The World Today,* London. November, 1947. pp. 485-490).
Presents various plans to modernize agriculture.

THE PROBLEM OF WESTERNIZATION IN MODERN IRAN. T. Cuyler Young. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. January, 1948. pp. 47-59).
An historical review from the 17th century to to-day.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF REFUGEES. Purushattam Thakar. (In the *Social Science Quarterly,* Bombay. October, 1947. pp. 37-47).
A study of refugees from Pakistan.

VI. POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS

BRITAIN, EGYPT AND THE SUDAN. Niloticus. (In the *Political Quarterly,* London. March, 1948. pp. 24-31).
Presents the British viewpoint.

L'ÉTABLISSEMENT DU RÉGIME CONSTITUTIONNEL EN SYRIE ET AU LIBAN. Edmond Rabbath. (In *Revue Égyptienne de Droit International,* Alexandria. Part 3, 1947. pp. 3-24).
Traces the course of government, giving its Islamic and Ottoman background.

OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF KUWAIT. Laurence Lockhart. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal,* London. July-October, 1947. pp. 262-274).
The discovery of oil in 1934 greatly enhanced interest in a country which had been an obscure Arab Shaikhdom for two hundred and twenty-five years.

POST-WAR DEVELOPMENTS IN AFGHANISTAN. H. R. H. Prince Peter of Greece. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal,* London. July-October, 1947. pp. 275-286).

The Government is concerned over the withdrawal of the British from India but is doing all it can to improve the condition of the people and the country.

THE REPUBLIC OF LEBANON. M. Perlmann. (In *Palestine Affairs,* New York. November, 1947. pp. 109-114).

Analyses the country's policies and problems.

WILL THE ARABS FIGHT? Kermit Roosevelt. (In *The Saturday Evening Post,* Philadelphia. December 27, 1947. p. 20 ff).

Believes open military action will not occur.

VII. INDIA

THE ECONOMY OF PAKISTAN. Duncan Crow. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. January, 1948. pp. 72-76).

Although primarily an agricultural country, Pakistan is already launching an industrial programme.

THE IDEALS AND PROSPECTS OF PAKISTAN. Habib Ibrahim Rahimtoola. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. January, 1948. pp. 28-40).

A policy of goodwill and cooperation will finally solve the tremendous social and economic problems facing Islam in India.

INDIA AND PAKISTAN TO-DAY. Sir Percival Griffiths. (In *The Nineteenth Century and After,* London. February, 1948. pp. 61-67).

An optimistic presentation, stressing internal affairs and the advisability of maximum help being given by Great Britain.

INDIA AND THE MIDDLE EAST. Sir William Barton. (In *The Quarterly Review,* London. January, 1948. pp. 37-43).

Discusses the danger of Communist infiltration in India and Pakistan through the North West and North East Frontiers due to the withdrawal of the British.

INDIA, PAKISTAN AND THE WORLD. Ikbal Ali Shah. (In *The Contemporary Review,* London. October, 1947. pp. 204-207).

Pleads for the admission of the two new states into the comity of nations as friends and equals.

THE PARTITION OF INDIA AND THE PROSPECTS OF PAKISTAN. O. H. K. Spate. (In *The Geographical Review,* New York. January, 1948. pp. 5-29).

Presents the situation in relation to population and economic resources. Maps and charts.

THE PUNJAB MINORITIES. Sir Percival Griffiths. (In *The Nineteenth Century and After,* London. November, 1947. pp. 205-211).

Examines the basis of Sikh-Muslim discord and its effect on Pakistan.